THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH

VOLUME XVII NOVEMBER, 1931 NUMBER 4

SOME NOTES ON THE TEACHING OF BUSINESS SPEECH

W. P. SANDFORD
University of Illinois

THE adaptation of established rhetorical methods to new types of speaking is not a new problem. The history of rhetoric might well be written in terms of such adaptations. The ancient development of forensic oratory was followed quickly by an application of its principles to political oratory; the classical theories of rhetoric were gradually moved over from the field of political, forensic, and occasional speaking to the field of sacred oratory; modifications innumerable have been made as new types of public address have developed. Today we are confronted, not only with the adaptation of previous theories to the use of modern means of communication such as the radio and telephone, but with their modification to fit the demands of a commercial age, in which definitely new types of speaking have come into prominence. The extension of public address to the conventions, conferences, group discussions, and indeed to the everyday routine of the business world is a phenomenon the existence of which cannot be denied. The increased use of a conscious technique in formal and informal address of a business type has already created a new set of "forms of public address," far more frequent in use than the older types of occasional oratory. Whereas only the few deliver occasional addresses, the many use the new forms. To stress this is to underline the obvious. One need not be a "business man" in the ordinary sense of the word at all to make sales or promotional talks, oral reports, good-will speeches, informal arguments, inspirational talks, or speeches of

explanation and instruction, or to take part in personal interviews and group conferences. Such types of speech as these are the very grist of everyday conversation and group discussion, and everyone, industrial leader, school teacher, minister, housewife, uses them frequently. (Indeed, the term "business speaking" may be an unfortunate one, since it conjures up in the minds of some guardians of the old academic order a picture of mighty magnates and terroristic "tycoons" attended by squads of subservient secretaries and platoons of yes-men, uttering their daily allotment of words with scientific abandon, if that is possible. Such a picture of the true function and academic place of training in business speaking is as distorted a caricature as the famous conference scene in *Beggar on Horseback*. Distortion of this type gets nowhere in the discussion of the problem.)

Let us make it clear at the outset that what we are interested in is the adaptation of standard rhetorical techniques to the everyday speaking problems of the individual. Practically every individual is called upon to have business dealings with his fellowmen. Unless he lives in a vacuum--academic or otherwise—his daily intercourse with others will demand of him the use of speech for practical ends. The uses to which he will put speech for practical ends may be termed the types of business speaking. He will wish to explain something, or to give instructions. He will be called upon for oral reports of informal or formal type. He must make—and resist--sales and promotional talks. He must encourage and reprimand his associates. He must take part in arguments—and even in our more or less cloistered college campuses, who doesn't get into an argument occasionally? He must make new acquaintances, tell them of his work, and gain their good will. All of these things he must do, even though the term "business man" may never be attached to him. And in addition to using all of these types of speech in ordinary conversation, he may be called upon to address group meetings of a social or civic type. *This is business speaking.* In the restricted sense of the terms, one may be a professional man, a tradesman, or a business man, but whatever his occupation, he uses the types of business speech. The skill with which he uses them determines, in part, his success—his ability to get others to like him, to agree with him, to do as he wishes. To foster the development of such skill is the true function of courses in business speaking.

In a sense, the function stated above is one which holds for all types of speech courses, but it is the particular concern of courses in business speaking, for in such courses the special rhetorical requirements of the several types are analyzed, and practice is afforded in composing and delivering them. Business speaking parallels other specialized courses, such as the traditional one in the forms of public address, and the one in debating. It is not meant to replace any such courses, but rather to supplement them. It is not meant to revolutionize the curriculum, but to develop it. When this is clearly understood, much of the controversial discussion about liberal versus vocational education, atomism, etc., will be relegated to its proper place. So, too, will that particular type of fallacious argument which, assuming that what is true of the part must inevitably be true of the whole, accuses proponents of business speaking courses of wishing to tear up the old curriculum, destroy all the culture, blot out the sweetness and light, and substitute for them accounting, stenography, business speaking, and advertisement writing. Perhaps it is traceable to ingrown stupidity and crass commercialism, but I am puzzled at the attitude of one who would offer courses in debating—a practical, definite, almost vocational art, at least for certain classes of students—the building and painting of scenery for stage productions, the lighting of stages, the makeup of actors, the correction of stammering, and the delivery and composition of commencement addresses, nominating speeches, sermons, and after-dinner speeches, and yet would shy from the thought of teaching people to make oral reports. If any applied-arts courses belong in the speech curriculum, why, may one ask, doesn't this particular one? About the only answer seems to be that it hasn't been done, and that maybe we aren't qualified to teach this particular work.

At any rate, the peculiar fallacy of composition which leads opponents of business speech to leap to the defense of the whole speech curriculum should be laid aside. Business speaking is not a curriculum; it is a course, and should be judged not as opposed to all present curricula, but merely in the light of the desirability and practicability of teaching it along with other applied-arts courses. If it happens to be a course the nature of which will make an appeal to greater numbers of students than interpretation, dramatics, debate, and the like, that is not necessarily an indictment of it. As a matter of fact, at Illinois, where it is offered side by side with

interpretation and debate as an intermediate course, it does make a wider appeal, and that without any special emphasis, requirement, or other advantage.

(Let me make it very clear that neither Mr. Yeager nor I has ever advocated a requirement that all students should take business speaking. Our position is this: that following a general course in composition and delivery, we believe a course in business speaking will be of greatest practical benefit to a majority of students. We would, therefore, offer such a course along with such courses as interpretation and debate. We would offer, in a more advanced group, the generally recognized courses in forms of public address, persuasion, dramatics, and the like. Business speaking is neither a required course nor one which displaces others with us.)

The best general answer to the question, "Can business speech be taught?" is simply this: it can be taught by the same methods by which instruction is given in other forms of public address. What is done by a teacher to prepare himself to teach the speech of nomination, acceptance, courtesy, the sermon, or the political argument? First, assuming a general background in rhetorical principles, he studies the particular requirements of each situation under which formal public addresses are delivered. He studies models of each form. He works out principles of composition for each type on the basis of this investigation. In a broad sense, he is then prepared to teach forms of public address. We do not require of him that he be an expert in the subject-matter with which all of these different forms are concerned. However, we do admit that if he is well-grounded in political science, he is in a somewhat better position to teach political speaking; that if he knows something of religion, he will teach the method of composing sermons more effectually. Primarily, however, we demand of him that he know the rhetorical technique of each form of public address, and that he be supplied with a fund of information concerning models of each form. Then, if he is otherwise a well-prepared teacher of speech, we conclude that he is qualified to teach this particular course.

One qualifies himself to teach business speaking by an exactly similar process. He studies the situations under which the various types of business speeches are given; he analyzes their special rhetorical requirements; he studies model speeches. As with the teacher of forms of public address, so with the teacher of business speaking:

if he has made business speeches, if he has a knowledge of the business world, gained through reading or experience, or if he has special training in business, he is better qualified than if he lacks such experience or training. But he is not expected to be, or to have been, a business man. His function is to study and to teach a rhetorical technique, just as it is the function of the teacher of other specialized courses in speech.

Therefore, when Professor Winans says that were he to offer a course in business speaking at Dartmouth, he would first engage Glenn Merry or some other former teacher of speech now engaged in business, we may agree with him that it would be a fine thing to do, but we cannot admit that it is necessary. We wonder if Professor Winans would follow his own logic to its conclusion, and close down his courses in political oratory until he could engage William Borah, Al Smith, or —Coolidge to teach them. We wonder whether he would refuse to give courses in dramatics until some member of his staff had toured the country with Mrs. Fiske, and had his name in the bright lights on Broadway for a season? We are told that a person need not be an excellent speaker in order to teach speaking (and Professor Winans, in his allocution *in re* H. A. H. seems to agree with that). If then, all other teachers of speech are exempted from the requirement of having been successful practitioners, *why* must the teacher of types of business speech *"have had the sense to make his million first?"* Reason would dictate merely that he be a student of business speaking, a reader and observer of business speeches, and a well-trained rhetorician. If he is those things, there is no more danger that former students of his will say to present students, "So you are falling for that bunk," than there is that former students of Professor Winans will say, "I used to think Professor W. a wonder when I was in school, but since then I have found that his persuasion doesn't persuade."

It is admitted that business speaking is relatively a new departure in education, and that the literature of theory concerned with it is relatively small. That is the reason why Mr. Yeager and I have written or compiled three books dealing with it: a book on the types of business speeches and the personal conference, a collection of representative business speeches, and a collection of problems, mainly for use in the teaching of the personal conference. We hope most sincerely that others, undeterred by the present discussion, may write

better books. Indeed, there are some texts now in print which deal more or less directly with problems of business speaking. Hoffman's *Public Speaking for Business Men* and Clapp and Kane's *How to Talk* are noteworthy examples. Such books as Overstreet's *Influencing Human Behavior* and Webb and Morgan's *Strategy in Handling People* also deserve mention. There is also a large literature of salesmanship, advertising, and business writing which is applicable. With this much available by way of books on theory, it is not too much to claim that some useful textbooks do exist.

When it comes to material to serve as models, it cannot be alleged that there is any dearth. The reports of business conventions and the like contain literally thousands of actual speeches given before business audiences. Mr. Yeager and I got the speeches from which we compiled *Business Speeches by Business Men*—by the simple expedient of writing to all of the associations of a commercial, industrial, or professional type listed in the *Public Affairs Information Service* and to a large number of private corporations, requesting copies of speeches. We gathered altogether about 3,000 speeches, the average merit of which might surprise the average teacher of public speaking.

There is at least as much material for classroom speeches on business topics as there is for speeches on any other kind of subject. The *Harvard Business Reports* and similar collections contain hundreds of specific problems which are used in colleges of business administration as the basis for courses in management, salesmanship, etc. Most of these problems are readily adaptable for problems in business speaking, either for platform talks or personal conferences. We have used problems of this sort for several years with what we believe a reasonable degree of success. Recently we have compiled our book of shorter problems, the principal advantage of which is expected to be that all members of the class, as well as those conferring, may be able to master the facts of each case and thus to appreciate more readily the handling of those facts by participants in the conference.

If the problem method is not used (we use it at present principally in the conference part of the course) there is nevertheless plenty of material to which students may be referred in preparing their speeches. There are many special indices of business books, such as *2,400 Business Books*, *2,600 Business Books*, and others, and ency-

clopedias covering special lines of business, to say nothing of a list of business periodicals which required, in our *Business and Professional Speaking*, four pages to print. These sources of material are generally available, besides the printed proceedings of numerous associations covering all fields of business and industry. In addition to all this by way of bibliography, may it be suggested that the special interests of individual students—either their past experience, or the business or professional subject in which they are most interested—may furnish abundant sources of material? We have had pre-medical students reporting, for instance, on health surveys of certain areas, athletic coaching students on the curricula in respect to athletics of certain high schools, journalism students reporting on subjects relating to newspapers, and so on. May it not be observed that in discussing the problem of selection of subjects and gathering of material one has a right to presuppose the exercise of a modicum of common sense and sound judgment on the part of instructor and student? When Professor Winans, in his good-natured employment of *reductio ad absurdum*, professes bewilderment on how to criticize a speech on "the market prospects for pork in Jerusalem," one is tempted to assure him that in a properly conducted course he would not face such a difficult problem. It would be as unlikely as that, in a course in forms of public address, he would have to solve the problem of criticizing a sophomore's commencement address, supposedly delivered before the graduating class of the Victorian Young Ladies' Seminary. It just wouldn't happen.

This material, in the form of textbooks, collections of speeches, association publications, problem books, and business publications, is all at hand for the use of instructor and student in business speaking. Admitting that only a start has been made in working out the theory, may we not still claim that there is material here for a course of a respectable academic type?

The content of the course in Business and Professional Speaking at Illinois, George Washington, and elsewhere has already been explained by Mr. Yeager. I wish to observe in passing that "fictitious audiences" to which objection has been made are not used in all of the assignments. In the sales talk, the oral report, and the informal argument (discussion of policy) the class is the audience. If the good-will speech and the inspirational speech are delivered to imaginary audiences, the harm done is not greater than that which would

be caused by delivering a commencement address or a nominating speech before a similarly imaginary group. In the conferences, when two students talk to each other—before the class—about a specific problem, there is as much reality as can readily be gotten into a classroom situation, and the class usually shows its appreciation of the handling of the facts by the respective conferrers.

Most of this paper has dealt with the practicability of teaching business speaking, since it has been on that issue that most of the discussion has centered. On the desirability of attempting to teach definite speech types of any kind there may be a difference of opinion, but if we have accepted courses in forms of public address, political and legal debate, play production, radio speaking, and the rest, it is difficult to see why we should make an exception in the case of a course dealing with the everyday, practical speech with which everyone is concerned. I advocate it, not as a replacement for any course now in the curriculum, but as a highly desirable addition, to extend the usefulness of our subject and to meet the needs of the great majority of our students. More research into the problems it presents, and a more open-minded attitude, rather than continued controversy and monotonous repetition of the slogan, "it can't be done," are in order. Or are all innovators and adapters to be "laughed off"? For my part, I would oppose no one who sought to widen the sphere of usefulness of our field, in whatever corner of it he happened to be working.

FOUR APPROACHES TO THE STUDY OF SPEECH STYLE

HENRY LEE EWBANK
University of Wisconsin

THE student who attempts to analyze and pass judgment on specimens of speech style faces, at the outset, a problem of considerable difficulty in deciding which of several possible points of view he should adopt for his investigation. There are, it appears, almost as many recommended methods as there are investigators in the field and each method has its claim for superiority. An analysis of these techniques, however, has led me to the conclusion that they may be adequately classified under four headings.

(1) *The Subjective Method.* The critic who uses this method in its extreme form studies the speech quite apart from the audience for which it was intended. He reads the speech, either silently or aloud as his preference dictates, and notes the effect the composition produces upon him. If the sentences are constructed with due regard for grammar, if the paragraphs are well formed and arranged according to some definite plan, if the words are arranged in sound patterns that please his ear, the critic passes a favorable judgment and bestows such words of praise as seem appropriate. If, on the other hand, the speech composition fails to meet his approval on one, or more, of these points, he refuses it a place in his collection of models and speaks of it only in terms of disparagement.

It is quite evident that the value of this method depends almost entirely on the special qualifications possessed by the critic for his self-appointed task. If he has a wide experience in addressing groups of various sorts, if he has learned to judge the worth of a speech by its effect on the audience for which it was intended, if, in his study of the speech, he visualizes it as being spoken by a definite speaker, to a specific audience, on a given occasion, his estimate may be of great value. But, should this background be lacking, if his only equipment for judging is a familiarity with the rules of rhetoric and some facility in written style, his pronouncements should not be regarded seriously.

At its worst, this method produces little more than a series of laudatory epithets which the critic applies to things that please him, and a parallel series of condemnatory phrases of various degrees of intensity which he uses in referring to speeches that he does not like.

Even at its best this method has serious short-comings. It is inevitable that each critic should come to have a preference for speeches of a certain sort and to dislike others which seem to have been received with great enthusiasm by audiences that heard them. It is equally inevitable that different critics will have different likes and dislikes; resulting often in quite contradictory estimates of the worth of a given speech. And, while it cannot be regarded as inevitable, the critic, unless he continues to speak before popular audiences, usually drifts, in both performance and preference, towards the academic style. Moreover, there is the tendency on the part of most of us to universalize our judgments, to come to regard them as

principles or laws, and to dismiss, as ignorant or prejudiced, those who do not agree with us.

Too often, in the past, our pronouncements on the literary values of famous speeches have been made by students of written style, specialists in the epic, the formal essay, or the structure of the sentence in the time of Chaucer, but amateurs in the field of the spoken word.

(2) *The Case Method.* The correct use of the case method requires the critic's presence when the speech is delivered. His report should include a description of the audience, of the occasion which brought the individuals together, and a statement of any strong initial reactions that they might have to the speaker or his theme because of their beliefs and prejudices. Thus, a case study of Booker T. Washington's address, *A Plea for his Race,* delivered at the opening of the Cotton States and International Exposition at Atlanta, Ga., September 18, 1895, would begin with a picture of a negro, born a slave, addressing an audience of negroes and whites on a topic that was charged with race prejudice. Lurking in the background of the white auditor's mind was the fear of black supremacy; the mind of the negro was filled with the sense of deepest wrongs long suffered at the hands of his captors.

Following the description of the audience and the occasion, the case study should include a report of the effect that the speech produced, not so much on the critic, as on the other members of the audience. The ideal situation would be for the person making the study to have a copy of the speech so that he might note on the margins such overt responses as he is able to observe. Failing that, the observer should take notes that will enable him to write in his comments on the audience-response when a copy of the speech manuscript is available.

The observer should be as objective in his attitude as possible, taking care that he does not simply record his own reactions and attribute them to the other listeners. The question is not, "Should the audience like this?" but, "Do they give evidence of liking it?" Not, "Does this please me?" but, "Does it please the group for which it was intended?" It goes without saying that the observer should not approach his task either as a disciple or as an enemy of the speaker; nor should he look down upon the audience as his inferiors or regard them as either partisans or opponents of his cause.

The Case Method should be regarded as an improved variant of the Subjective Method. It is an improvement in that it gets the critic out of his study and makes him an observer of the effect of the speech on others. We should not forget, however, that this method is still subjective. The observer regards the audience through glasses colored by his own likes and dislikes, and places his own interpretation on the overt responses, of the lack of such responses, which he observes. And even distinguished, and supposedly skilled reporters, viewing the same speaker and the same audience, often record quite different and even contradictory accounts of what took place. Witness the following differing accounts of the reception of Lincoln's Second Inaugural:

The special correspondent of the *London Times* wrote:

"I am just in time to hear Mr. Lincoln deliver the last words of his singular but pathetic address. Is he not far grander and wiser and greater today than when four years ago he came from Springfield?"[1]

The *New York Times* noted:

". . . the extreme simplicity of this address, its calmness, its modesty, its reserve. We have a President who will be faithful to the end, let what betide."[2]

Carl Schurz wrote:

"This was like a sacred poem. No American President had ever spoken words like these to the American people. America never had a President who found such words in the depth of his heart."[3]

Compare these statements with the judgment of an editorial writer of the *Chicago Times*:

"We had looked for something thoroughly Lincolnian, but we did not foresee a thing so much more Lincolnian than anything that has gone before it. We did not conceive it possible that even Mr. Lincoln could produce a paper so slipshod, so loose-jointed, so puerile, not alone in its literary construction, but in its ideas, its sentiments, its grasp. By the side of it, mediocrity is superb."[4]

[1] Dodge, D. K.: *Abraham Lincoln, Master of Words;* New York, 1924, p. 84.

[2] *New York Times,* March 5, 1865.

[3] Dodge, D. K.: ibid; p. 85.

[4] Editorial, *Chicago Times,* March 3, 1865.

But in spite of the ever-present danger that the record will be colored by the reporter's failure to distinguish between what he sees and what he wants to see, the Case Method offers the best available procedure for studying actual speeches on actual occasions. It seems strange that more studies of this type have not been made by trained observers in our field. Most of the available studies were written by news writers or casual members of the audience who happened to be present at what turned out to be an important occasion and who afterwards wrote down what they thought they remembered.

(3) *The Laboratory Method.* This method usually makes no attempt to study the actual speech or the actual speech occasion. Instead, an attempt is made to set up a controlled experiment so that the ability of the auditors to answer questions concerning the facts, contained in especially constructed speeches may be measured by the use of objective tests. Professor Jersild used this method in his experiments to determine the relative influence of the factors of primacy, recency, frequency, and vividness on memory.[5] The relative effectiveness of three different styles of radio address in imparting information to the hearer is also being studied in a series of experiments now in progress at the University of Wisconsin.[6] Three sets of forty fictitious items of information are prepared and tested for differences in ease of recall. After they have been equated, these sets of "facts" are expanded into speeches as nearly alike in all respects as possible, except for the matter of style. The speeches thus prepared are given over the radio by the same speaker and to the same audience. After each speech the members of the audience are given a test to determine the number of items they are able to recall. The order in which the speeches are given is changed at each repetition of the experiment.

The Laboratory Method has all the advantages and the disadvantages of the controlled laboratory experiment. The disadvan-

[5] Jersild, Arthur, "Primacy, Recency, Frequency and Vividness," *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, XII, No. 1, February, 1929; see also "Modes of Emphasis in Public Speaking," *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, XII, No. 6, December, 1928.

[6] Whitehead, Albert E., *An Objective Study of Oral Styles in Radio Broadcasting*, Ph.M. Thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1930.

Fulton, Albert M., *A Study in Modes of Oral Style in Radio Broadcasting*, M. A. Thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1931.

tages lie in the air of unnaturalness and artificiality that almost inevitably prevails at the time of the experiment, in the difficulty of controlling all of the factors except the one under investigation, and in the fact that a piece of speech composition is an exceedingly complex thing, containing many factors that do not lend themselves to this method of analysis. The advantages, which, in my opinion, outweigh the disadvantages, lie in the fact that the critic's subjective judgment is replaced by objective evidence from a great number of auditors, thus giving a body of data which will yield to statistical and graphical methods of analysis. It is believed that continued experimentation of this sort will eventually supply a body of valuable information from which may be drawn conclusions more accurate than the intuitive dicta of the books on rhetoric.

(4) *The Method of Statistical Analysis.* A fourth method, seemingly, originated by Professor L. A. Sherman,[7] seeks to discover the secrets of effective composition by gathering data on the practice of noted authors as to sentence length, predication, subordination, word length, the percentage of structure and content words, the relative frequency of the various parts of speech, the proportion of loose and periodic sentences, the number of repetitions of key words and ideas, and other similar items than can be observed and counted with a fair degree of accuracy. This method originated, at least in part, as a protest against the types of literary appreciation common in the schools not long since, when "the usual method was to read, to investigate the meaning of obscure words, to look up allusions, to outline plots, to discuss characterization, to ejaculate over beauties; in the case of poetry, to scan and to memorize."[8] Professor Rickert, whom we have just quoted, analyzes style into (1) imagery, (2) words, (3) thought patterns, (4) rhythm, (5) tone patterns, and (6) visual devices—an item which does not concern us in our study of speech style—and attempts "for each of these to find graphical and statistical methods by which its varied manifestations in different pieces of writing may be understood with a definiteness and a certainty impossible through reading alone."[9]

[7] Sherman, L. A.: *Some Observations upon the Sentence-Length in English Prose,* University of Nebraska Studies, Vol. I, No. 2, October, 1888.

[8] Rickert, Edith: *New Methods for the Study of Literature,* Chicago Press, 1927.

[9] *Ibid.,* p. 7.

The Method of Statistical Analysis was the first used in the study of speech composition by Professor Gladys Borchers in her objective study of the differences between written and oral style.[10] A more recent study by Raymond H. Barnard makes use of almost the same methods in analyzing the speech style of Wendell Phillips during the various stages of his career.[11]

Like the other methods of studying speech composition, the use of statistical techniques is also subject to certain disadvantages. Many of the elements of good speech style—the matter of concreteness or abstractness, for example—do not lend themselves readily to objective evaluation. To continue with the example, it is impossible to tell whether many words are concrete or abstract. Concreteness and abstractness are relative matters; the listener can say, "This paragraph is more abstract than that," but further he cannot go. Indeed, it seems at times that it is only the more obvious elements of style that can be listed and catalogued with certainty.

There is also the difficulty of determining the significance of the data, once it has been gathered. One can conclude that this speaker uses sentences that are measurably shorter than the other, but he cannot properly conclude, without further investigation of another sort, either that this difference in sentence length is important or that it is merely accidental and without significance as a criterion of excellence in speech style. It is easy to get lost in a wilderness of data, deviations, and differences; it is easy to look at the trees so minutely that we fail to see the forest.

And yet we should not conclude that the Method of Statistical Analysis is thereby discredited. On the contrary, it is the best method yet devised for studying those elements in speech style that can be classified and charted with some degree of certainty. The microscope does not give us a picture of the whole man in action, but its use has enabled the trained observer to classify and conquer armies of dangerous germs whose existence was before unknown. The use of the microscope marked a new epoch in the study of medicine; it may be that the use of similar methods in the field of rhetorical analysis will yield commensurate results. That Professor John M.

[10] Borchers, Gladys: *A Study of Oral Style*, Ph.D. Thesis, Unpublished, University of Wisconsin, 1927.

[11] Barnard, Raymond H.: *An Objective Study of the Speeches of Wendell Phillips*, Ph.D. Thesis, Unpublished, University of Wisconsin, 1930.

Manley of the University of Chicago so believes is evidenced by the following statement from his introduction to *New Methods for the Study of Literature*:

> "Style is a vital organism and consequently is neither the arithmetical nor the algebraic sum of its parts. But in all the sciences of organic life analysis is a necessary preliminary and an indispensable aid to the understanding of the complete functioning of the organism as a whole. Certainly we shall never learn the secrets of style by merely mooning over them or by ejaculating admiration. Every artist who has ever learned a lesson in technique from his predecessors has done so by a more or less incomplete analysis of its elements, by focusing attention upon the manner and means by which individual technical difficulties were overcome and technical successes achieved."[12]

We conclude, therefore, that each of the four approaches to the study of speech style has its shortcomings as well as its elements of superiority. To no one of them alone can be entrusted the entire task; no one of them should be worshipped as the one and only method of style analysis. Conclusions drawn from the use of either of the objective methods should be checked and correlated with the subjective judgments of trained and critical observers. It is not necessary to take sides and be either a follower of the objective approach or a disciple of the subjective school. Each has its own values; each yields results that the other methods cannot produce. The wise student of speech style will make use of all four approaches and of any others that he may be able to devise.

[12] Manley, John M.: Introduction to Rickert's *New Methods for the Study of Literature*, 1927, pp. x-xi.

IN STRICTEST CONFIDENCE[1]

HOWARD H. HIGGINS
Miami University

MANY of the elements of effectiveness in speech-making need to pass through the alembic of science. If we are to arrive at the factors which make public speaking effective we must observe both those factors which are tangible and those which are intangible, those which we may analyze easily and those the analysis of which is a severe test of our mental acumen, those which are rhetorical and those which are psychological.

We cannot do research in public speaking properly until we know the sources from which we draw those elements which make speaking effective. It is undoubtedly generally agreed that speech, when it has an object, is an effort to get attention and to influence behavior. A most superficial attempt to list the major facts which enter into effective public speaking is obviously: rhetoric, voice and other bodily action, the personality of the speaker, the audience, and the setting for the address.[2]

The first two factors, (rhetoric, and voice and other bodily action) have been stressed by two well known and well established "schools" of speech teachers: the rhetoricians and the elocutionists. Each school has emphasized its particular hobby so long that all of us have been duly impressed by the importance of both rhetoric and elocution in effective speaking—if, indeed, a little experience in speaking had not already impressed us with the importance of both those factors. As a matter of fact there is a fairly large percentage of the training in speech-making in our high schools and colleges

[1] *To be read only by teachers of speech-making.*

(This article is the result of hearing several times at the last national convention "Oh, I'm doing my work in voice science now," from former majors in speech-making.)

[2] In "setting for the address" are included such factors as the kind and amount of light upon the speaker and the audience, kind and temperature of the air, nature of seats and the seating arrangement, the occasion, nature of the advance publicity for both the meeting and the speaker, the nature of the introduction given the speaker by the chairman and his conduct during the address, and numerous other similar factors.

which is limited rather largely to "training in the literary, logical and physical mechanics of public speaking."[3]

At one of the recent regional conferences of speech teachers, one of the speakers actually publicly defended the practice of giving in departments of public speaking, training only in the literary, logical, and physical mechanics of public speaking.

Are rhetoric and elocution the only factors about which we should be concerned in our courses in speech-making? Kindly permit me to give an answer to this question by means of an illustration. Several years ago when I was teaching in an institution where the public speaking instruction was under the direction of the Department of English, we had on one particular occasion a larger registration in the public speaking courses than could be handled by those of us who were public speaking teachers. With the usual acumen of a teacher of Old English who administers the public speaking instruction, we were loaned one of the teachers of Freshman English Composition who had once taken a few lessons in elocution. This teacher of freshman rhetoric conducted this public speaking course just as you might expect: he criticized the use of complex sentences; he insisted that the students stand with their feet at a certain angle and that they gesture in specified ways; the crime of crimes in that course was the mispronunciation of a word—in other words, he gave attention only to the literary, logical and physical mechanics of speaking as though those factors were the only ones which entered into effective speaking.

At this same institution that year Dr. —, of the University of Chicago, gave a series of three addresses on three outstanding presidents of our country. He had a fair audience for the first lecture because all history students were required to attend. No one was required to attend after the first lecture. I heard such good reports of the speaker that I decided to go on the third evening. I went early and was unable to get a seat. The University Auditorium was literally packed to hear a history professor lecture on the life of one of our former presidents. The attention was so close that—to use a commonplace expression—a falling pin could have been heard. Yet the speaker used highly complicated sentences, slouched upon

[3] H. A. Overstreet, *Influencing Human Behavior*, W. W. Norton and Company, New York: 1925, p. 71.

the lectern through his entire address, gazed almost fixedly at a ventilator in the middle of the auditorium ceiling, and talked almost in a monotone; in fact, he violated almost every rule of the teacher of the literary, logical and physical mechanics of speaking, yet a voluntary audience packed the University Auditorium to hear him speak. Now, if a man can violate practically every rule that is laid down for effective speaking and be as successful as Dr. — was, one wonders if the analysis of the elements of effective speaking was complete.

I am not saying that rhetoric and elocution do not have a place in effective speaking. They do have—and a very important place. This Dr. — would have been even more effective had he been able to profit by the teachings of this teacher of freshman rhetoric. However, if a speaker could succeed as Dr. — did and violate practically every principle of effective speaking as given by this teacher of freshman rhetoric it shows that this teacher's analysis of the element of effectiveness was incomplete. This does not mean that his teaching was of no value. It was of value; he did teach his students some worthwhile things. Nor is this particular teacher to be censured; he was the victim of unfortunate circumstances; he realized his deficiencies and acknowledged them.

But when one who is a teacher of public speaking by profession makes such an inadequate analysis should we judge him so charitably? Then when he attacks others for attempting to make a more complete analysis, what may we think of him? When a man is satisfied that all that can be learned, has been learned, he is dead educationally—or possibly it would be more charitable to say that he has not yet been born educationally. When one devotes his entire time to eulogizing the rhetoricians of antiquity and to attacking any attempts to make advances he becomes an educational fundamentalist of the rabid type. Advances are made by people who use each finding of science and each great work of the older rhetoricians as stepping stones for further advance rather than as tombstones to commemorate the passing of the men who said all that could be said on the subject. If the only research we can do in the field of speech-making is to dig around in the manuscripts of the dead rhetoricians it might be wise to consider the transfer of research in speech-making from the department of speech to the department of archaeology. If no more valuable research work remains to be done in effective speech-making

than digging in musty manuscripts, counting words,[4] and giving so-called analyses of the effectiveness of dead speakers (which are really rhetorical analyses of the manuscripts of these speakers), we should be honest enough to acknowledge that all the advance has been made in our field that can be made—because Aristotle said it all! We ought to acknowledge as a matter of common honesty then that graduate work in speech-making consists only in teaching students what has already been learned and that we keep them busy by applying Aristotle's yardsticks to various great orators—preferably dead ones.

If that is all the future there is for research in speech-making let us have one grand, glorious celebration at our next national convention (Detroit offers unusual facilities in that respect) and thank Providence for any salaries we may have drawn for doing research in speech-making, then have one solemn memorial service

[4] At a recent convention of the National Association one of the speakers told of a graduate who was directed to make a list of all the topics discussed in eight of the most commonly used textbooks in speech-making, to count the number of words each author devoted to each topic, to strike an average and to determine which author came nearest to using the average number of words for each topic. This bit of so-called research was designed to prove which was the best textbook in the field of speech, because as the instructor explained, the book which came the nearest to the average number of words represented the consensus of opinion of the authorities in the field.

The speaker was not interested in the least in attacking persons, as the person who directed the work about which he was speaking was a personal friend; he was careful so to phrase his account of the incident as to give no clue whatever as to the identity of the individuals or of the school concerned. He expected that others would differ with him regarding the value of such work and would defend it, and that still others who agreed with his point of view regarding the merits of such projects would emphasize the point that this type of research was the exception rather than the rule—to which the speaker would have agreed. The speaker felt that it was a wholesome thing in his own private circle of graduate teachers to point out what he felt to be dangerous tendencies. To his amazement, however, instead of taking either of the reasonable attitudes given above one member of the association (not in the school in which the incident had occurred) immediately launched into a personal tirade against the speaker in which he vehemently declared that the speaker had cited as actual instances ones which were invented by the speaker! Still another teacher in yet another school indignantly demanded in private whether the speaker had been talking about her!

for the grand old field of research in speech-making, give it a decent burial, and make a public announcement of the interment.

In the April, 1931, number of the QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH there was a cleverly phrased and interesting article by James A. Winans entitled, "Is Public Speaking Out?" It surely looks that way, if one may judge by the relative size of the speech-making sectional meetings at our national convention.[5] It would seem that the dramatics and the voice science sections continue to grow while the speech-making section seems to decrease in size. In the normal course of affairs this would hardly be expected as normally we should expect more undergraduate students to take speech-making courses than courses in either of the other two fields,[6] and under normal conditions we should then naturally expect to find more teachers of speech-making than teachers of dramatics or of voice science, and consequently then more graduate students in speech-making than in either dramatics or voice science. But a casual observation of the attendance at sectional meetings by the younger members of our profession who are doing graduate work shows that a large number of them who actually teach speech-making are attending the various voice science sectional meetings. I was struck forcibly at the last convention by the number of my professional friends and acquaintances who have been interested primarily in the speech-making field who told me that they were now doing their graduate work in voice science.

Why is this? I began to wonder after a few of my friends told me of the changes in their fields for graduate study, so inquired of those who thereafter told me of making such changes. Of course,

[5] In my reply to the question, "Is public speaking out?", I have, of course, obviously considered that question from an entirely different standpoint from that considered by Mr. Winans.

[6] This does not imply that I believe that speech-making is more important than dramatics or voice science. I refuse to be a party to such an argument; that would seem as foolish as debating whether air or water were more beneficial to mankind; it would be impossible to get along without either. I mean that more college students have more practical use for speech-making in after school life and one would naturally in the normal course of affairs find more serious minded students taking those courses, just as one would expect to find more people taking English than trigonometry because more people feel that they will have greater practical use for English than for trigonometry in after school life.

there were various answers given, some quite specific, some vague; some indulged in personalities, others discussed relative merits of different phases of the work, but most of their replies could be summarized in this manner: Voice science is in about the same stage of development that medicine was at the time of the discovery of the germ theory; there is a large, undeveloped field open which presents a tremendous challenge to one with an inquiring mind; *truly significant research is being done in the field of voice science; we are getting somewhere with our research in voice science.*

This, fellow teachers of speech-making, is what some of our former students who have transferred to the voice science field are saying of us; the inference is plain. Now among the various passing attitudes which we may take to these charges there are two which might occur to us first. We can wax exceedingly wroth and resort to invectives, sarcasm and personal innuendos. While this reaction to their explanation for leaving our field would probably relieve our feelings considerably and would appear to us as a telling analysis of the situation which would put these deserters in their places, it would probably appear to outsiders that their explanation had come rather close home or we would hardly have become so incensed about the matter. Another possible course for us to pursue is to consider seriously whether there be any truth in their explanation and then to determine a course of action calmly, without casting aspersions at either individuals or fields of study.

A cursory examination of speech department catalogs and of published lists of these seems to indicate that a goodly number of the departments do their graduate work in speech-making largely in the two more tangible factors which enter effective speaking: rhetoric and elocution (mostly rhetoric, however). It is easy to understand why this is done. These factors are more or less tangible; methods of directing graduate study in these fields are well established; it is relatively easy, after an instructor gets accustomed to the technic, to direct research and the preparation of a thesis on "An Analysis of the Effectiveness of the Oratory of John Doe (1732-1789) and Its Effect Upon His Time." But possibly a more important factor than any of those just mentioned, in determining the type of research, graduate study, and thesis writing done in speech-making at some of our institutions is the vogue of "the scientific method," which to these men means accurate registration and measurement, the working out

of definite correlations,—graphs and curves, and the indulgence in mathematical formulae. This can be done when we count the number of simple, compound and complex sentences in John Doe's early speeches and compare the percentages in the early addresses with those of his later addresses, or when we work out the percentage of Anglo-Saxon or Latin words, or the relative frequency of the use of the words on Thorndyke's list of the one thousand most commonly used words. This does give us some sense of satisfaction; it does make us feel that we have arrived educationally; it does make us feel secure in the academic aristocracy because we apparently are using the much desired scientific method. And as Koehler says,[7] "Certainly, the quantitative and the accurate indirect methods are the most imposing features of exact sciences *now* when we review them or consider them superficially. But we ought to be aware of the fact that in most cases this procedure is a mere refinement and end result of the underlying free and direct observation, without which there would not have been a basis upon which to build the refined superstructure. In the eighteenth century Cavendish measured the resistances of different materials by comparing shocks he received in his arm when conductors of those materials were used to connect him with a battery, the other pole of which was in his other hand! Was that improper? On the contrary, it was perfectly sound in a young science, which was trying to find that first knowledge of facts upon which more refined methods may afterwards be founded."

In our desire to use "the scientific method," to use accurate registration and measurement in speech-making, we have not imitated the very kernel of the older sciences but we have merely assumed the outer, quantitative form of exact science. Again quoting Koehler,[8] "Think of a physicist interested in all types of motors who would restrict his study of them to the following tests to be applied to all the various types: measurement of their volume, of temperature at their surface, of ionization of the air in their neighborhood, of their actual frequency of revolution, and of the total weight of their bodies; who would calculate from these data an average 'power-coefficient' for each of them, define 'power' by the method, never ask a question about the working process in their interior, and remain

[7] Wolfgang Koehler: *Gestalt Psychology.* Horace Liveright, New York: 1929, p. 42.

[8] *Ibid.*, pp. 49 ff. I am inserting the material enclosed in parentheses.

satisfied by this quantitative procedure for many years. I know I am exaggerating in some respects (in this analogy) . . . . I do it intentionally in order to call attention to the main point, viz., that admiration for quantitative method leads us almost exclusively to those research tasks which immediately afford us an opportunity for measurement. Given the natural narrowness of human interest, the next consequence will be our failure to see those problems which do not lend themselves immediately to quantitative investigation, problems which may be, however, the more essential and the more scientific, in a deeper meaning of the word. In such problems qualitative observation and experiment would constitute the first step; but since in adult physics (as it appears from without) these methods seem to be despised, we dare not undertake these fundamental tasks. Wishing to be utterly scientific, we may just miss those opportunities for research which, in our stage . . . . would be the most scientific of all. The nature and the actual development of our problems should determine the methods to be followed. What actually happens, however, is that an imposing method blurs our view of the subject-matter. This method then begins to decide what problems we shall see. . . .

" . . . I do not criticize the method as such; I have used it myself. But we should never forget that, when used exclusively, it may make our knowledge of behavior narrower. With a given problem in mind we exclude a great many behavior possibilities by our choice of experimental conditions. We do not see them any more. . . . Even then the procedure may be valuable, if the experimenter is one of those who always finds new and productive problems for experimentation. For most of us, however, conservatism may become the consequence of such an attitude, since admiring figures and curves, we keep away from the true source of new ideas and new problems in our youthful science: i.e., for a broad outlook upon our subject-matter."

It would appear in some cases that restriction of graduate study and research largely to the two factors of rhetoric and elocution has enabled us to assume the outward appearance of the quantitative form of exact science. Other highly important factors of effective speaking have been avoided possibly because they seemed intangible and did not seem to lend themselves to study by the quantitative method. In other words the field of research in speech-making is in

just about the same place the field of chemistry would be if chemists restricted their research to what we might call "the more tangible chemical elements"—i.e., those few elements which may be found in the free state, such as gold, copper, silver, and six of the platinum metals. But the chemists have not been content to limit their graduate work, research, and thesis writing to what we might term "the more tangible elements" but have discovered ninety elements and are busy attempting to discover other unknown elements, two of which they are sure exist but which they have not yet been able to discover. They have done this although it would have been quite possible for the chemists to have devised enough experiments about the elements found in a free state (which were easily discovered and comparatively easily dealt with—as are the elements of rhetoric and elocution in speechmaking) to make a sufficient number of courses in chemistry to fulfill the research and credit hour requirement for the Ph.D. degree. In addition to laboratory experiments on these elements they could have indulged in comparative studies of the writings of various ancient chemists about these elements. This, so some of our graduate students, who have left our field for the field of voice science, say is just what is happening in some instances in the speech-making field. Is it true? I know that it is not true in some schools which are doing excellent research in all the factors of effective speaking. But I know also that a speech teacher from a reputable school urged teachers of speech at one of our regional conferences to limit their undergraduate teaching to the elements of rhetoric and elocution. The speaker acknowledged the fact that psychological as well as rhetorical and elocutionary elements entered into effective speaking but argued against the teaching of the psychological elements largely on the grounds that "we do not have the time to teach all the elements so we had better hold to rhetoric"; the speaker gave an eulogy of Aristotle and the inference that Aristotle had said about all that needed to be said on the subject. Suppose that years ago when chemists found a few of the more easily discovered elements they had objected to attempts to investigate and to teach other elements on the grounds that teachers of chemistry "do not have the time to teach all the elements so we had better teach only those elements for which we already have worked out a convenient teaching and experimental technic"!

But if we haul in our anchor and leave the familiar ground of rhetoric and elocution for research in the relatively unknown, we are

starting upon an exceedingly difficult and hazardous journey. It is difficult—even more difficult than the first efforts in other sciences. As Madison Bentley explains[9]: "There is one important point at which the psychologist's concern with experience differs from that of all the other sciences. The objects and events of physics and of the rest are regarded *as if they outlasted the experiencing of them and continued as independent of the act of apprehension.* . . . the objects and the operations of the psychologist . . . . *are* only when they are-in-experience. For their existence the organism must be at hand and it must be intact. A whiff of nitrous oxide, a blow upon the head, the stoppage of a blood vessel, and they are gone. Experience then ceases. It is bound to the functioning body. We cannot of course say that it is unreal just because it is evanescent or because it is dependent . . . .

". . . . Instead of taking an entire experience as it comes, an experience too complicated and too rapid for observation, we take out of it bit by bit single items, which are to be treated as exhaustively as possible until we know their properties or 'dimensions' as well as the various ways in which they stand related to other similar items. Analysis is the initial step in all scientific inquiry. Nature never displays a single, simple, isolated object. Objects are themselves complex and they appear in a context made up of other objects. Chemical substances are generally found in combination; sunlight is compounded of a great number of wave trains of varying lengths, plants and animals are vast colonies of cells or of minuter structures, and each cell or part itself contains many intricate compounds. Experience, too—when we depart from the detached and dependent worlds of our common knowledge and of our physical science—shows a complexity which is just as great and just as embarrassing to describe."

The vast amount of truly scientific and practical research which ought to be done on the numerous problems associated with the platform personality of the speaker really staggers anyone who considers them. There are veritable diamond mines of valuable information in that one field alone which greatly need to be discovered, digged, and presented to the world by means of the tools of research. The numerous elements which enter into that factor which we label "the

[9] Madison Bentley, *The Field of Psychology.* New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1924, pp. 31, ff.

audience" is another challenge to those with exploring minds who are equipped to do research. The almost countless number of elements in "the setting for the address" presents a well-nigh inexhaustible opportunity for significant research to one well grounded in psychology, physics, and—for certain problems—chemistry. It ought not to be possible for graduate students to leave the field of research in speech-making for the field of research in voice science and to tell us with significant inflections as they speak that "truly significant research is being done in the field of voice science; we are getting somewhere with our research in voice science."[10]

But not only is our venture upon the sea of research in the intangibles of our field difficult because of the very nature of the problems themselves but it is likewise hazardous also for another reason. Jesus Christ once said that not all those who cried, "Lord! Lord!" would enter the gates of Heaven. Nor are all those who are willing to proclaim themselves psychologists truly scientific. Probably there is no field of science in which there are so many pseudos as in psychology. Almost anyone who has made a few observations about "human nature" seems willing to set himself up as a psychologist. And the general public seems willing to accept him as such due to the human tendency to feel that when we have invented or discovered a name for an unfamiliar object we then know the object itself.

"Were intimate acquaintance a substitute for systematic and orderly knowledge, we might look for our most famous botanists in tropical jungles, for anatomists in the great meat-packing concerns, and for psychologists among the crowded tenements. More than a mass of material taken in the gross is required. Detachment is required, as well as the means for submitting the raw material to the methodical refinements of the sciences."[11]

There is a significant distinction between information and description, between comments and analysis, and the recognition

[10] Any fellow teachers of speech-making—and especially those who direct graduate work—whose ire may be aroused by this sentence are reminded that these are not my insinuating charges; I am repeating only the words of a few former majors in our field who have left us. Don't direct your invectives at me; I'm not in a pugilistic frame of mind at all on this delightful June morning.

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 3.

of that distinction is one of the first steps necessary in the making of a psychologist. When one fails to make this distinction he commits what is known in psychology as the error of information; he simply gives information that such and such a thing occurred; for instance—he may observe "that a group of individuals when animated by a single purpose reacts differently than would a single individual in that group were he by himself and cut off from the group," then offers a list of the characteristics of a crowd, and call it the "psychology of crowds." The ability to give superficial information about a crowd does not qualify one to be a true psychologist any more than the ability to give a superficial description of the appearance of an angora cat qualifies one to be an anatomist. Yet to the general public this ability to talk about "human nature" and the brass to call oneself a psychologist is about all that is necessary to be accepted as an authority on "the psychology of . . ." To be truly psychological, to be scientific, we need not merely comment and give superficial information as to what happens, but we need to analyze the elements of experience and to state in accurate terminology the factors involved in it.

Shall we continue to concentrate our efforts in graduate study in speech-making in digging in the fields of rhetoric and elocution? Shall we remove to the field of voice science? Or shall we *continue* to work in the fields of rhetoric and elocution, *and* to undertake to dig to a greater extent in the less trodden, highly important, rich fields which are awaiting our spades?[12]

[12] The writer would like to make clear two attitudes: 1. He is not opposed to the growth of the voice science fields. He is pleased to see the remarkable development in that field; he would like to see the same rate of development going on in the research side of the speech-making field.

2. He is not *against* rhetoric and elocution. Just because a person favors an increased activity in some line of work does not mean that he is against work in all other lines.

There are a few souls who seem to be naturally pugilistic; they enjoy attacking everybody else. Such people frequently rely upon two special technics: 1. Sarcasm and personal aspersions; 2. Placing their self-appointed "opponent" in an absurd position in order to make him appear ridiculous. Hence the reminder that the writer is not against voice science, rhetoric and elocution.

By the way, the observation about human nature just made is an illustration which might have been made in the next to the last paragraph of the above article. It is an illustration of a mere superficial comment about human nature and does not indicate that the one who makes the observation is a psychologist.

SPEECH ACHIEVEMENT IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

IRENE POOLE
Public Schools, Akron, Ohio

THE aim of early speech training should be to enable the child to express himself adequately in all situations that require the exercise of speech functions. Such situations arise when the infant babbles his first interpretable sound. They increase in frequency as the child's speech functions develop, and become an educational problem when the child, normally possessed of the elemental tools for speaking, is thrust into the group life of the kindergarten. The elementary school should aim to assist the child to express himself fully and efficiently. This aim should mould the curricular content of the educational program from the kindergarten through college.

The present discussion aims to consider how the elementary speech class can help to achieve efficiency in the social functions of speech, through development of the several phases indicated by the section headings.

DELIVERY

Effective speaking of any type depends largely upon the physical presentation of the subject matter. Children like to learn to talk well, and the earlier they begin, the more effectively and un-self-consciously they learn to do it. Three things are considered simply:

1. Good position, with freedom of bodily movement;
2. Pleasant voice, loud enough to be heard;
3. Clear diction and accepted pronunciation.

The first thing we notice about a speaker is his body. With little children a fine device for gaining bodily freedom is to pantomime a short story or part of a story for the audience before telling it. If the story is well known, the audience may guess the name of it or of the incident presented. Then the speaker, in a very few sentences, may tell the story.

The very short, three or four sentence composition is the best medium with which to begin speech work with children at any age; one thought, one sentence!

Occasionally, with an older child, who has had little or no experience with group programs, the method of developing bodily

freedom may be reversed. Let us assume that the child has considered his message, and knows what he wants to say. Let him find a comfortable position for standing, one in which his hands and feet will not be in his way, or by their activity take attention *from* what he is saying, and let him talk without gesture. He may now deliver his message with some degree of ease. After a few performances, he will have learned to "think on his feet," and his attention may safely be called to bodily expression.

The "chair drill" may be employed effectively now. Let him practice talking while he is sitting down, and have him try to use his hands to *emphasize* what he is saying. The freedom thus afforded can be extended to the whole body while standing as the speaker gradually becomes at home in the situation. With children who are not trained to see the appropriateness and effectiveness of bodily movement, this method is better than practicing before a mirror. It encourages spontaneity, and discourages stilted self-consciousness.

This one point must be borne in mind in all work with children: they can accomplish remarkable things if they do them *one step at a time*. The most natural first step in delivery is bodily movement, pantomime, gesture. But if this seems awkward for any individual child, let him start with something he can do with the least effort, and develop ease of delivery step by step from the known to the unknown, as he gains control of his thoughts, voice, and articulation.

The next thing we notice about a speaker is his voice. It should be loud enough to be heard, of pleasing quality and pitch, with varied and appropriate inflection, and perhaps some indication of characterization, in case the story has several characters in it. The rate of speaking should be regulated to fit the size and type of the audience and the room, and the spirit of the story.

With normal speakers, little more is needed than a suggestion to lower the pitch ("Use your bass voice"), or to increase the force ("Let us all hear you"), or to slow up a bit. Generally speaking, the fast talkers among children either are the quick thinkers, or those who suffer from a generally accelerated physiological metabolism. The latter are probably pathological cases, and until their physiologic problem is corrected, it were best not to call attention to the speed of their speech. For the other group, whose thoughts travel faster than their tongues, much patience is required to adjust the two

factors by suggesting pauses, prolongation of vowel sounds, clean enunciation, accent and stress, and sympathy for the listeners!

With fair examples to copy, most children develop a taste for good diction and accepted pronunciation, and practice it upon their classmates in their speech programs. They develop a critical attitude toward their own pronunciation, as well as that of their friends, and take great satisfaction in settling discussions concerning pronunciation by referring to the dictionary. Sixth grade children have been known to learn, of their own will, to read phonetic symbols in order to use their teacher's pronouncing dictionary.

ORAL READING AND INTERPRETATION

When the child comes to the oral reading class, he has already learned to translate printed symbols into thought pictures. The oral reading class should help the child to use efficiently another set of symbols—speech sounds—in order that he may translate his thought pictures for an audience. In doing this, he may be aided by bodily action—posture, facial expression, and gesture—of the kind that best fits the thought he wishes to impart.

The reading material for oral interpretation should be just a bit easier than the child can read and understand silently, and it should contain a wealth of interpretable situations.

The oral reading class ought to be a period of enjoyment—recreation, if you will—with emphasis on *ex*pression rather than *im*pression. Unless it is the accepted thing to expose one's inner feelings without fear of embarrassment, unless there is freedom of expression in the oral reading class, it has not served its purpose.

It is fatal to spontaneity and naturalness if, in the class, a child's own interpretation of a part of the story is not accepted by the teacher. If the child's interpretation is entirely unreasonable, let him hear interpretations of the same passage by his classmates, until he has found one that better satisfies him.

When introducing variety in voice, it is helpful to use descriptive words and phrases that are easily within the range of a child's comprehension, as "squeaky," "smooth," "whiny," "soprano," "bass," "like a frog," "like a bird," "like your mother's when you have hurt yourself," etc. Any device which assists the child in his perception of the quality should be used. Often, if a situation is dramatized,

either with voice or in pantomime, it helps to develop concrete thought images.

A word about poetry. So many children have never learned to love poetry for its own sake. May there be suitable rewards in the place where teachers go, for those thoughtless ones who have assigned "so many verses" to be memorized as punishment for a pupil's neglect or misdemeanor! If the teacher has no keen appreciation of poetry herself, she should ignore it *completely* in her classroom, and trust that the next teacher may make up for her deficiency.

A number of children who loved poetry were asked once how they came to develop such an appreciation for it. Every one answered that he had first learned to like poetry because he had, at one time, heard some one read a poem or group of poems beautifully. The speech teacher should be able, by her own reading, to stir up in her children a real desire for reproducing poetry.

Her selections must have a real appeal for the child soul. Poems of Christina Rossetti, Robert Louis Stevenson, Eugene Field, and other poets who have written not *to* a child's soul but *from* it, have this appeal. In reading, the music of the selection, the melody of the language, the rhythm, and the tempo should be evident, but they should not receive emphasis in any discussion until the children have discovered their presence. The primary consideration is thought content. If this is the aim from the very first, there can be little danger of "sing-song" rhyming. If all forms of speech are to be considered as thought-conveyors, and poetry is recognized as a form of speech, the purpose of it must be recognized first of all as a thought medium.

Children will discover the music in the poetry for themselves when they try to tell the story of the poem in their own words. Many children will come to think in poetic language, and they will delight in creating their own verses. There is no other such outlet for overwhelming emotion as framing it in a poem. The children may organize their own poetry clubs and verse-speaking choirs. But, best of all, they will not skip over the chance verses in their independent reading. They will, indeed, search for poems, and beg to read them in class.

If we were to name two "do's" for the children's oral interpretation class, they would be: "Find the thought, and then make your voice and body fit the thought when you tell it."

ORAL COMPOSITION

Formal grammar, of itself, is not to be taught in the speech class. If there seems to be a serious deficiency in a class in the use of proper word forms, language games that illustrate and drill in correct usage offer excellent material for oral work. Such games are suggested in nearly all of the later language textbooks in greater detail than would be permissible here. However, the speech class should provide a stimulus for the study of formal grammar and the practice of accepted usage. It is the one place where the child can learn to express his ideas for the best effect upon an audience, and he should not be hampered in his attempts by fear of using the wrong word construction. Good English, in other words, should be an ideal for the speech class, but not an impediment to freedom of expression.

The child speaker should learn in the speech class to obtain clarity and simplicity of thought units. He "begins his thought with a capital letter and ends it with a period," and avoids connecting words like "and," "an' then," "well," "why," "ah," "er," etc. He discovers how to punctuate his speech with pauses and inflection, as he would with signs in his written composition. Proficiency comes not in a week, or in a semester, but by constant example, criticism, and practice, along with interest and desire to learn.

A child should be taught early to choose introductory and concluding material, saving the theme of his thought for development in the main part of his story. If the child can be taught to begin at the beginning of what he has to say, and follow through his thought with one sequence after another, how much easier it will be for him later to make the complexities of his adult thoughts clear to an audience!

Talks need not, and should not, be lengthy. In the first grades two or three sentences are enough. A fine exercise is to limit children to three or four sentences in telling their thoughts upon a subject. Children enjoy doing this as an exercise in extempore speaking, when each is assigned a topic. They like to be expected to think quickly and then have the effect of their thinking evaluated for them. They are thrilled if they are allowed to assign such topics to their classmates. Many an odd moment at the end of a class period may be spent profitably in this wise. What shall the children talk about? The answer is: Anything that interests them. If a child is really

concerned about something, or enjoys it very much, he will talk about it anyway. He ought to have time, place, and audience provided for the telling. In the school, this is the speech class. His talk flourishes before his listeners. And unless he is reproducing facts, what matter if the content enlarges with his imagination? Here is the beginning of creation. In one school, for several years, the first assignment for talks in the fall was based upon interesting individual experiences of the summer. It was not to be a chronological report of the entire vacation, but one or two definite incidents elaborated in some detail. For the same children, the last assignment of the year was: "Tell about what you would like to do this summer, if there were no reasons why you couldn't do it." The play of imagination in these talks was really thrilling. Plans would be presented for all sorts of experiences ranging from learning to milk a cow to flying to Mars in a torpedo.

If the children choose their own subjects, they should be sure that they are worthwhile and enjoyable to everyone in the audience. They should use sufficient detail to hold interest and clarify statements. But, above all, they must want to talk about their subjects.

A child may wish to reproduce the composition of some one else through story-telling, narration of experiences, book reviews, jokes, or announcements. At first, poor choice of subject is the child speaker's greatest weakness. This is especially true of jokes. But with careful criticism, direct suggestion, or occasional definite assignment, a taste for the best and most worthwhile in topics for oral entertainment can be developed. This will not come in a day, either.

The question will arise: What shall we expect children of different ages to accomplish in the matter of oral composition? If there is, in the formal English course of study, a definite program of oral composition, it should be followed by supplementary activities in the speech class. If there is no such outline, the speech teacher will have to formulate one of her own that seems to fit the needs and difficulties of the children.

Here is one tentative outline of a workable program in oral composition:

> Grades one and two: short story-telling; simple narration of personal experiences; two or three sentence talks; announcements.

Grades three and four: descriptions; poem appreciation; character interpretations, detailed narration of experiences and events; book reviews; jokes.

Grades five and six: exposition; class room discussion; persuasion; memorized selections.

Grades seven and eight: discussion of current issues; argument.

There will, of necessity, be a great deal of overlapping between the grade standards. No program should be so rigid that it cannot be adapted to changing situations. If a child in the third grade wants to tell how he made his bird-house, he should not be denied this opportunity on the grounds that exposition belongs in this program for the fifth grade. This type of program is suggested because it is well for the teacher to have some comparative standard that would indicate with about what degree of proficiency in oral speech the child will leave a certain grade. If used consistently it will be a guide for the presentation of new material and will avoid repetition.

CONVERSATION

Analysis of the qualities of a good conversationalist involves such vague and indefinable elements that it is difficult to decide whether or not the art of conversation can be taught. Criticism of the children's conversations may be offered from two points of view:

1. Is the subject of conversation interesting to the listeners?
2. Does the speaker have a rich store of information concerning the subject of the conversation?

In the lower school, children may set themselves to discover the personal interests, hobbies, or curiosities of their playmates. For a speech exercise, these bits of information can be used as a basis for very informal conversations. These may take the form of dialogue and be presented extempore before an audience. Or the class may be divided into small groups for free conversation. Children tell of their hobbies, special interests and achievements of their parents or acquaintances, their pets, travels, and experiences. They exchange opinions of likes and dislikes and preferences. The exchange helps to develop new concepts, and exposes the child to a vast fund of factual information which he could not otherwise get except through extensive personal experience and lengthy study.

One elementary class, whose members were particularly at home in almost any conversational situation, spent one half hour each week before an improvised microphone "broadcasting" topics of current issue. They learned, through the discussions which followed, to evaluate news, connect it with historical backgrounds, and with certain limitations, predict its outcome. The elements of opinion, persuasion and argument enter into these discussions. They require careful supervision.

DRAMATICS

Pedagogical literature has long recognized the efficiency of children's dramatization as a means to educational achievement. If there has been a deficiency in this recognition, it has been that children below Junior High School ages have been somewhat neglected. A decade ago, the play element exemplified by dramatization, was introduced by every wide-awake normal school graduate into every recitation in her classroom, even to the personification of digits in arithmetic. As a visual device, this method may be condoned, but it could hardly be justified as dramatization. For dramatization is not only personification, but interpretation. How absurd to expect a child to interpret one of twelve calves the farmer sold for fifty dollars each! Or to express the emotion of a carrot as it is assimilated by the child's blood stream!

Fortunately this has not been all. Recitations in reading, literature, and history have been aided in the accomplishment of their objectives by dramatization of the more creative sort. If the child is given opportunity, with his childish appreciation, of course, to interpret some character in the dramatization of his history lesson, he is creating as fully as his experience permits. Characters become *alive*, and their experiences *real* to the students. There cannot be too much of this kind of creative work with children. Reading lessons, and literature appreciation classes vibrate with their spontaneity and enthusiasm.

The speech teacher may use these same reading lessons or selections from the children's literature as vehicles for presenting the foundation structure for later more formal dramatics. Much time can be spent with pantomime, stressing freedom of bodily movement and physical interpretation. The old game of "charades" is a good exercise. It is really motivated pantomime. Children should be encouraged to observe how a voice sounds when it is happy, sad, tired,

coaxing, cross, excited, etc., in order that they may use variety in their vocal interpretations. Differences in pitch and quality may be recognized by children even of kindergarten age.

Later, perhaps in the third grade, characterization may be emphasized. Each character in a story should be analyzed carefully and his peculiar traits and emotions exemplified in the vocal and physical interpretation of the children. At this age, lines may be memorized with safety, if there is real need for it. Certain technical stage expressions may be introduced, as *cues, right and left stage, upstage, downstage, center, offstage*. Attention may be called to the *stage picture* and *balance*. These terms and expressions should then be used consistently by the director, whether teacher or child, at all rehearsals and class dramatic activities.

Fifth and sixth grade children can call stage business and properties by their right names. They can divide the duties of their staff for each play according to the offices of director, stage manager, property manager, costume director. For children's performances, there should never be need for a prompter. If, for some special occasion, lines are memorized, each person should be entirely dependent upon himself for remembering them. Experience with children will prove that the best performance is never so well "finished" that it has become mechanical. If the children think about the characters they represent, and if they understand the dramatic situation, they are not apt to forget lines or business.

Costumes can be created by the children themselves. Makeshift affairs with most clever turns appear from piles of curtains, drapes, wire hangers, hemp rope, and what not. Children are keen to discover the "trick" of a period costume and to suggest it with very simple materials and patterns.

To attempt to make miniature professionals from juvenile actors in the schools defeats the purpose of children's dramatics. This happens if much attention is paid to elaborate staging, costuming, and make-up. Dramatization, as interpretation, is a justifiable end in itself. Lighting for normal occasions varies only in degree of intensity, so elaborate makeup is unnecessary. For more pretentious productions, for public or paid entertainments, when effective lighting is part of the picture, simple high-lighting of certain features, or simple heightening of color is permissible and in conformity with good taste. Seventh and eighth grade children can achieve remarkably

artistic results from their experiments with lighting and scene construction. Funnels, tin cans, and automobile headlamps are put to service as spots and floods. Chicken wire and window screening are used as frames for color media.

The less that is represented by the stage setting, the greater the possibilities for the actors in their interpretation. Boys of the middle and upper,—and indeed sometimes of the very lowest grades, can construct presentable window frames, gates, fences, and furniture from the lumber of store boxes and orange crates, at the expense of little more than time and effort. These make-shifts set the curtained stage with splendidly suggestive effects.

There are all sorts of interesting experiences to be anticipated in the use of puppetry with children. Very little folks can construct their own puppets of cardboard and string, and have a fine time lending their own voices for a real marionette performance on the stage of an orange-box theatre. As an early exercise for motivated vocal interpretation, these puppet plays are unexcelled. Older children in correlation with their art work can construct jointed puppets from papier-maché, cotton, and wires. If there is an electrical department in the school, extensive lighting plots can be planned with the use of Christmas tree lights. As a usual practice, however, puppetry ought not to be used as a speech project alone until all other methods of creative dramatization have been exhausted.

PERSUASIVE SPEAKING AND DEBATING

One of the consummate joys of working with children in the elementary schools is the opportunity thus afforded for experimental attempts at developing with them arts that have been hoarded with jealous care in the secondary and college curricula, not to make of the children miniature adults, but merely to set into motion certain interests and processes that will prepare them for more advanced work. Any of the speech arts can be adapted to worthwhile uses for children. Debating is no exception. But *it must be adapted.*

If we consider the most rudimentary elements of debating to be clear, purposive thinking, persuasion, and argument, let us consider how students of the elementary grades can exercise these functions.

In his youthful community, a child encounters many situations requiring the use of argument and persuasion in order that he may accomplish certain ends toward which he has set his efforts. He

wants to sweep sidewalks in winter and needs a sales talk with which to approach his prospective "customer." He has an idea for improving his class organization and must present it convincingly. He wishes to spend an afternoon in the park and must meet possible parental objection courteously. Children should cultivate a clear distinction between persuasion and coaxing. Many opportunities for exhibiting success in persuasive speaking, when only one side is presented, are offered with school activities as: sales talks for carnivals, paper sales, school publications, membership in Parent Teacher Associations, or student organizations; "pep" speeches attending contests and special drives; propaganda talks on thrift, safety, courtesy, care of property, self control, holiday or "special week" observances. As soon as a child learns how to present a topic upon which there is only one reasonable opinion, he may learn how to present his ideas when there is a clash of opinion.

In the very lowest grades, debating can be introduced as simple exchange of opinion about something well known to all of the children. Questioning others' opinions, and the urge for argument becomes an acute problem at about the age of the fifth grade. This is the "psychological moment" to introduce rules for argument and formal application of the rudiments of debating.

A fifth grade child can present logical briefs on a question he understands. He admits only one side, for he has well founded convictions about a problem before he attacks it for debate. But he can outline the possible arguments on either side of the question, and he likes to do it.

It is only reasonable to suppose that the question for debate is one in which the children can have a genuine interest, and one with which they have a working acquaintance. It might be safe to say that no problem should be considered for debate unless it has arisen from a vital difference of opinion among the children themselves. We would go even further and assign no place for debating in the class as an exercise in itself, but only as a medium for presenting two sides of a *vital* discussion. Such problems arise every day within the school. Building policies, student government, safety, choice of vocation, topics that have developed from classroom discussions of history, civics, etc., offer unlimited sources of debatable problems.

Formal debates will seldom take more than ten minutes, with two speakers on each side. Each speaker will probably have not more than two strong arguments, for which he has found ample proof and evidence. Then he will have as much refuting evidence as he can gather. Constructive speeches are given extemporaneously from clearly built outlines. In rebuttal, the child is stimulated to think straight. The average child debater will fail in his earliest attempts to refute arguments which he has not anticipated. To avoid this possibility and its attendant sense of failure, it is well to have children make rather full outlines of their rebuttal speeches, including in them refutation of as many arguments as they can foresee. Then, rather than attempt to meet an argument for which they are unprepared with adequate evidence, they ignore it. Each speaker crosses out of his rebuttal outline, refutation for any points the opposition has not presented, and uses the remaining parts of his outline as the basis of his rebuttal speech.

Two seventh grade teams of girls, in considering the question "Resolved that bicycling on public highways should be prohibited by law," added a third member to each team, whose one speech should be entirely refutation. The concluding speeches were made by the first constructive speaker of each team, who merely summed up the case of her side. This original procedure had an excellent effect of force and clarity on both the speakers and the audience.

PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE

In this field again we trespass on the realm heretofore reserved for adults. For their class and club organizations, the children need to know how to elect officers, to deliver nomination speeches, to make and second motions, to introduce new business, to dispose of old or deferred business with expediency, and to carry on intelligent discussions from the floor. These things each child may learn to do.

The responsibilities of the chairman, president, or other presiding officer, and the courtesy due his position must be recognized by all the group. Children, as a rule are fundamentally loyal, and when they realize that they have pledged their loyalty and respect to the president when they have elected him, and that a majority of them asked him to accept this responsibility, they try hard to show their loyalty to him.

Certain expressions such as "take the chair," "have the floor," and certain terms such as "motion," "nomination," "second," etc., should be explained and their uses understood before any procedure begins. Then the terms and phrases should be used consistently. The third grade is not too early to begin this practice. It is advisable to have a rehearsal of each procedure before it is attempted with children of this age, to make them automatic in their selection of terms.

If the teacher supervises the first meetings most diligently, never permitting the misuse of a single word nor the single usurping of authority, order will be popular. It will be part of the game. Children soon get into the habit of addressing the chair before taking the floor, also of calling a procedure by its right name.

As soon as need arises, children can be taught to use authoritative rules of order with intelligent interpretation. Robert's "Primer of Parliamentary Law"[1] may be recommended for this purpose.

ORGANIZATIONS AND TRAINING OF OFFICERS

The elementary speech class, with its informality and flexibility of program affords a place for activities, valuable in themselves, which have no definite status in the curriculum. Class organizations, with their combination of speech activity and character building are splendid adaptations of the speech class period. Here, an audience is provided for speech programs, there is drill in group courtesies, and children learn to accept the responsibility of leadership.

The number of offices, and length of periods for which officers serve, depend upon the peculiar purposes each organization is expected to serve. At least two elections each semester would be recommended, in order to give as many children as possible the duties of leadership. Once a month is not too often if the class meets every day.

Almost any organization would need a president, a secretary, and a program adviser. Each of these should have an assistant to care for his duties in his absence or to attend to certain responsibilities that may be delegated to him.

The president is the leader, the guiding hand of his organization. He assumes the duties of a presiding officer, and conducts all class

[1] Robert, Joseph Thomas: *Primer of Parliamentary Law;* New York, Doubleday Page, 1923.

meetings, elections, and discussions, and supervises the work of committees. He is expected to make all announcements to his class, or see that they are effectively presented, whether they come from one of the members of his class, the editor of the school paper, the physical education director, or the principal of the school. He must make the meaning of the announcement clear, and see to it that the persons concerned with its execution do their duty promptly.

The position of program adviser is the most responsible of all. He must select topics for programs, correlating them as closely as possible with the current interests in other classrooms. He must appoint a chairman for each program and assist him in finding suitable material and in rehearsing his program. Most classes find it convenient and desirable to divide the membership into more or less permanent groups, teams, or sections, each assuming responsibility for certain programs.

In addition to these officers, middle and upper grade classes may choose to elect a critic, if there is in the class, a person whose judgment in evaluating the elements of a program is reliable, and whose opinion is respected by the class. The problem of criticism looms ominously over the first speech programs, because of the danger of making the speakers too conscious of themselves. There is only one solution for this problem, and that is the development of the same ideal of *helping each other* that exists with the correction of the spelling words or arithmetic problems. More successful criticism may come from individual members of the class, or from an appointed critic who serves for one program only, than from an elected critic. If the acknowledged purpose of criticism be *helpful suggestion*, the form in which it is given matters little.

Special appointed committees are often needed to supervise arrangements for some definite project. These committees are selected with a view to special fitness of the members for the responsibility. These members, with their chairman, must employ the resources of the school—library, art, music, cooking, sewing, manual training, electrical departments—as well as the most efficient way of dividing costs and responsibilities. Usually the maximum cost to the class is zero cents, the committee having used successfully the resources of the home attics and cellars and pantries, grocer's boxes, newspapers, and what not.

The justification of presenting speech as a curricular activity in the grades is that the child may *learn by doing* while he is growing in speech attainment and mental aptitudes. We can begin as soon as the child enters the kindergarten with what he already possesses—speech function, physical activity, interests, and imagination. And we augment these, grade by grade, with such new exercises as are motivated by the experiences of his school life.

THE SPEECH PREPARATION OF JOHN BRIGHT

FRANCES FERIS
Laramie, Wyoming

IN a study of the orator John Bright, the conclusions to be drawn concerning his methods of speech preparation are perhaps the most usable in a classroom. First having comprehended something of this English speaker's success, the most mechanical "victor record" among a group of secondary school debaters and orators, weakened by handbooks, College Debaters' Annuals, and complete cases for $5.00, will recognize the good counsel of Mr. Bright as to a thorough knowledge of subject matter, careful but not too detailed outlining, and wise use of brief notes. In addition to these educational values and conscience pricking reminders to be set up from Mr. Bright's speaking experiences, this paper attempts to give a partial picture of the man during the preparation of a speech, and to present arguments attempting to show that Mr. Bright was not dependent upon a memorized or completely written speech, but that he did adapt his speech to his audience and to the occasion.

The story goes that Cobden and Bright were driving down to the House of Commons together, upon the occasion of a great debate in which they were to take part. Cobden was anxious, nervous, and depressed, while Bright was beaming with anticipation. Cobden is credited with remarking, "I know you can enjoy it all and perhaps it is best so. But I hate having to beard in this way hundreds of well-meaning, wrong-headed people, and to face the look of rage and loathing with which they regard me. I had a thousand times rather not have to do it; but it must be done."[1]

[1] Nation, Volume 4, June 13, 1867, p. 478, *Bright as an Orator*.

The difference is that John Bright could enjoy making speeches because his chosen business was speech-making; not carpet manufacturing, his brothers attended to that; and not serving the government on the Board of Trade, his secretaries attended to that.[2] He was primarily drawn into the Corn Law League and politics because he was a speaker capable of translating the theories of that League into language so simple and graphic as to be understood by the weariest laborer. He remained in politics and Parliament because he gave voice to the discontent of industrial England and could so well "beard" those "hundreds of well-meaning, wrong-headed people" both in and out of Parliament. Their looks of "rage and loathing" only added vigor to his words.

Furthermore, speech-making became his art. No one can say whether the moral and political issues were uppermost in his mind or the form of the speech and the appropriateness of the words. It is as unsatisfactory to give a definite answer to that question as it is to say that prison reform was Goldsmith's guiding motive in writing the *Vicar of Wakefield*, or to say that Whittier wrote many of his poems only to further abolition. Art and morality were just as inseparable with John Bright as they were with the novelist and the poet, or as they are with any real artist.

Speech-making became Bright's joy, his passion, his very life. In the preparation of a great speech, the man seemed to forget the working of the world about him; he was lost in the contemplation of his subject. Like many other artists he became moody, irritable, and preoccupied.[3] The Romanticists, with their emphasis upon the inner man and the endeavor of the literary genius to portray to the world the imaginings of the hidden man, coined the term, 'artistic temperament' for the dreamy-eyedness and nervousness which accompanied creative work. John Bright by his uneasiness and forgetfulness while a speech was in process well merited this descriptive phrase. One of his traditional complaints, which he made on mornings shortly before he was to appear at a meeting was 'that the day was cold.'[4]

[2] O'Brien, R. B.: *John Bright: A Monograph*, Houghton-Mifflin Company, Boston and New York, 1911, p. 220. The testimony of the secretary to the Board of Trade, Mr. Shaw Lefewre, later Lord Eversley.

[3] North American Review, Volume 155, p. 318, *Reminiscences of John Bright by his Nephew, Charles McLaren.*

[4] Trevelyan, George Macaulay: *The Life of John Bright*, p. 384, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston and New York, 1913.

One of Mr. Bright's interviewers has given us the information that he was much addicted to wearing a dressing gown about his apartment, as was also Carlyle; and dressing gown in this case stood for no velvet frogged smoking jacket, but a long, ample, warm robe falling well below the knees.[5] This homely, comfortable habit of dress gives us some notion of the relaxation he perfected for creative work. Anything as formal and stiff as a desk was shunned as being inconducive to speech thinking. Lounging about his room or flat on his back among the pillows with the lights turned very low, he was in his favorite atmosphere for speech composition. In 1866, when he was perhaps at his height, he wrote: "I find when in bed that my ideas come easily and fix themselves on the mind. I suppose the dim light and the silence are favorable to the imagination and the memory."[6] In 1872 we find him saying much the same thing, "When I am going to make a speech on a subject I care about, I lie awake three or four hours every night for several nights thinking about it."[7]

But the 'artistic temperament' did not evidence itself only in solitude. When he was at home in Rochdale, he sought out his friends, the mill hands and even the gardener to try on them his arguments and illustrations.[8] This anxiety for the corroboration of his friends, encouragement from the simple-minded, hard-working citizens of his home town, must have made his preparation of speeches in London somewhat unsatisfying. His opportunities there to shape the speech in conversation were very largely denied him.

The speech took form, then, in Mr. Bright's mind almost entirely by unwritten contemplation. He was not a classical scholar. The divisions of Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian were evidently unknown or disregarded by him, for it is not likely that he had read enough of them to have formulated any precepts on the art of oratory from their works. Yet form in a speech meant much to Bright; he had a sense of balance and rhythm which it is safe to

[5] Smalley, G. W.: *London Letters and Some Others*, Volume I, p. 116, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1891. Letters under date of March 9, 1889.

[6] Trevelyan, op. cit., p. 384.

[7] The Speaker, Volume 7, January 7, 1893, p. 13, *A Girl's Recollections of John Bright.*

[8] Littell's Living Age, Volume 181, June 1, 1889, p. 547, *Mr. Bright*, R. W. Dale (a friend of Mr. Bright's from Birmingham.)

conjecture would not have been aided materially by a thorough knowledge of these classical writings on oratory. He was pleased to call his building plan for a speech, the "coast-line," and this shore of his he maintained should not be carefully charted. He insisted, however, that the promontories should be marked in bolder relief and never allowed to recede from view by tiresome and unnecessary cruising among the inlets and up divergent streams. It was the "headlands" that he kept in mind when formulating a speech.[9] He selected those few outstanding issues which he wished to keep before his listeners and he had a happy sense of what was enough to say to make his point. He made clear just this endeavor of his in talking to Sir Richard Langye, "Don't speak unless you have something to say. Don't be tempted to go on after you have said it."[10]

Mr. Bright found no need for typewriters and stenographers, since it was only the line of the speech which he noted down. They would have proved irksome and confusing to him. Each main argument was jotted down in longhand on a slip of paper of convenient size to be dropped into his hat as he spoke.[11] Facts and figures were treated in a similar way. His peroration he almost always wrote out in full, knowing that, for him at least his summation was the well sounded harbor, the advantages of which must be made especially clear and tempting to his audience. His words and illustrations for the most part he left very largely to take care of themselves at the time of speaking, relying upon a mind well stored with good literary models.

To a man with whom a speech was a work of art, as it was with Bright, words and illustrations came in his contemplation of the subject which would naturally return as he delivered the address. All the more would this be true of a man with Bright's remarkable memory. It is sufficient to say in this regard that he knew at least

[9] The Speaker, Volume 7, January 7, 1893, p. 13, *A Girl's Recollections of John Bright.*

Trevelyan, op. cit., p. 383.

North American Review, Volume 155, p. 319, *Reminiscences of John Bright by his Nephew, Charles McLaren.*

[10] O'Brien, op. cit., p. 248.

[11] Littell's Living Age, Volume 181, June 1, 1889, p. 548, *Mr. Bright,* R. W. Dale.

two poets pretty much in their entirety, Milton and Whittier,[12] and his familiarity with Bible passages was a matter of common knowledge and comment. Bright seemed to have a fear of knowing his words too well. Upon one occasion he gave Mr. George W. E. Russell some "hints" on speech-making, and Mr. Russell in recalling Bright's advice, put these words of recollection into the great orator's mouth, "You can't prepare your subject too thoroughly; it is easy to over-prepare your words. Divide your subject into two or three—not more—main sections. For each section prepare an 'island,'—by this I mean a carefully prepared sentence to clinch your argument and then *trust yourself* to swim to the next island. Keep the best island for the peroration of the speech, and then at once sit down."[13]

Further elaboration of his theories as to speech-making may be gained by perusing a letter which he devoted to this subject. In 1888 a Rev. G. E. Cheesman wrote to ask his advice as to the various methods of preparation for public speaking; namely: writing speeches and reading them; writing and committing to memory; and sketching the heads of the topic, trusting to the inspiration of the moment for the words in which to clothe the thought. Mr. Bright wrote in reply:

> "As to modes of preparation for speaking, it seems to me that every man would readily discover what suits him best. To write speeches and then to commit them to memory is, as you term it, a double slavery, which I could not bear. To speak without preparation, especially on great and solemn topics, is rashness, and cannot be recommended. When I intend to speak on anything that seems to me important, I consider what it is that I wish to impress upon my audience. I do not write my facts or my arguments, but make notes on two or three or four slips of notepaper, giving the line of argument and the facts as they occur to my mind, and I leave the words to come at call while I am speaking. There are occasionally short passages which for accuracy, I may write down, as sometimes also—almost invariably—the concluding words or sentences may be

[12] O'Brien, op. cit., p. 242, North American Review, Volume 155, *Reminiscences of John Bright by his Nephew, Charles McLaren*, p. 319.
Smalley, op. cit., Volume 1, p. 122, Dated March 9, 1889.

[13] O'Brien, op. cit., p. 247. This information was secured in an interview which Mr. O'Brien had with Mr. Russell shortly following Mr. Bright's death.

written. This is very nearly all I can say on this question. The advantage of this plan is that while it leaves a certain and sufficient freedom to the speaker, it keeps him within the main lines of the original plan upon which the speech was framed, and what he says, therefore, is more likely to be compact, and not wandering and diffuse."[14]

If his subject required special information, he went after material in no uncertain fashion; his conscience would have allowed him to do no less. In the winter of 1844 and 1845, he began to plan his attack against the Game Laws. He went over the ground thoroughly, going down into the country to interview farmers, landlords, poulterers, and poachers. He wrote to his sister-in-law during that winter that he had had an interview with the "greatest poacher in England." In addition to visiting as many rabbit runs as possible, he wrote countless letters seeking information. His correspondence on the Game Laws alone during that winter would have filled quite a mail bag, for he reckoned the number of letters at between 30 and 60 daily. A scientific experiment was also conducted to ascertain the amount of food which a rabbit could consume, and in 20th century statistical language, it was discovered that "four and a half rabbits consume as much food as a sheep." By February 25, 1845, armed with his statistics, testimony of farmers concerning their individual losses as a result of the inroads of hungry game, and stories of poaching affrays, he was prepared to move in the House of Commons for a Committee to be selected which should inquire into the operation of the Game Laws.[15]

Mr. Bright may have been called indolent upon occasions,[16] but simply because making carpets, from which business he absented himself, requires visible effort, and making speeches less noticeable exertion, is no ground for labeling him a lazy individual. A corpulent man who is fond of talking, and who does not boss large gangs, wield a shovel, or direct a huge enterprise is apt to be called indolent. Speech-making was Mr. Bright's business, and although it may not

[14] Leech, H. G.: *Public Letters of John Bright*, pp. 298-299, London, 1895.

[15] Trevelyan, op. cit., p. 126.

[16] Smith, Goldwin: *Reminiscences*, p. 241, Edited by Arnold Haulbain, MacMillan Co., New York, 1910.

Russell, George W. E.: *Portraits of the Seventies*: p. 172, Unwin, London, 1916.

be so productive of perspiration, nevertheless it takes effort, as the above illustration shows. Again relying upon the information of a man with whom he was very intimate during the period when he was on the Board of Trade, we quote Mr. Shaw Lefewre, the Secretary of that Board: "Mr. Bright spent much labor in preparing his speeches. His speech in 1869 on the Bill for disestablishing the Irish Church was one of the best he ever made. It was the subject of long thought and preparation."[17] He seemingly read every book available on the Irish question.[18] In addition he had made three journeys to Ireland before the year in which this speech was delivered; in 1833, 1841, and 1866, with the express purposes of studying the situation at first hand and of uniting the people in their protests.

Perhaps the most comprehensive idea of Mr. Bright's deep thought and anxiety over a speech from the time of its conception until it was given, may be gained by his very obvious relief and lightheartedness after the speech was over. The writer cannot help feeling that perhaps some of his excitement and conviviality on these occasions might have been due, also, to his feeling of satisfaction with the address. When a speech in the House was over, it is said, he would retire to the members' smoking room, or stand with his back to the fire in the division lobby. There to a group of admiring parliamentary friends, who crowded about him, he would hold a post-mortem on the speech, and often on the whole debate of which it was a part. His nephew, Charles McLaren, gives us a most appealing and sympathetic picture of the great man upon his completion of a speech at a public meeting. The nephew reminisces as follows:

> "He would fall into his host's easy chair with a cigar, and talk far into the night on a thousand trivial topics to which his language lent a thousand charms. Dogs, parrots, innkeepers, Scotch ministers, minor poets, royalties, American visitors, sayings and doing of the political world, Highland gamekeepers, great men and small men, all interested him. No one who has ever felt it will forget the fascination of that monologue which seemed to gather force and interest as the hours went by."[19]

[17] O'Brien, op. cit., p. 220.

[18] Ibid., pp. 60-61. He wrote to a friend, "I am reading about Ireland and thinking about her almost continually."

[19] North American Review, Volume 155, pp. 318-319, *Reminiscences of John Bright, By his Nephew, Charles McLaren.*

It is surprising how a dispute could ever have arisen as to Mr. Bright's dependence upon written helps at the time of delivery. But such being the case, it is the burden here to show that Mr. Bright depended only upon notes for his main ideas and that for the most part he trusted to the inspiration of the moment to bring his words. Quoting again his words on preparation: "I do not write my facts or my arguments, but make notes on . . . notepaper, giving the line or argument and the facts as they occur to my mind, and I leave the words to come at call when I am speaking."[20]

There might possibly have been circumstances of short notice or extreme precaution for accuracy, upon occasions when Mr. Frederick Harrison heard Bright speak to cause the latter to write: "His great orations were often fully written out, and I have seen the manuscript pages handed to the reporters as each sheet was turned over. His great speeches were undoubtedly written out and learned."[21] Such evidence is the direct opposite of that which we have read from the pen of the orator himself. Supporting testimony, however, would seem to bear out the belief that Mr. Bright practiced the advice he was giving to another.

In the first place, the written thoughts which Bright took with him to the platform were his outline, any figures and authorities which he might be going to use, and his peroration which was almost always written out in full. Mr. Goldwin Smith writes in this regard: "The question whether his speeches were prepared has been debated. But there can be no doubt upon the point. I have stood by him when he was speaking and seen the little sheaf of notepapers on each of which probably his sentence or his catchword was written and which dropped into his hat as he went on."[22] Preparation of his speeches most assuredly he practiced, but this evidence does not prove that they were written out and memorized. Mr. C. A. Vince, his biographer, gives a statement further strengthening this view. "The notes that he took with him were merely a few heads and catchwords. Those that he used in his speech of July 1, 1886, have been preserved. They cover nine pages of note-paper; they are neatly

[20] Littell's Living Age, Volume 181, June 1, 1889, pp. 547-548, R. W. Dale.

[21] Harrison, Frederick: *Autobiographic Memoirs*, Volume I, p. 306, Macmillan, London, 1911.

[22] Smith, op. Cit., p. 238.

written, and, being without erasure or interlineation, must have been copied from a first rough draft. A familiar quotation from Scripture is written in full, as though Bright distrusted his memory."[23] Mr. O'Brien states on this same point: "Bright took infinite pains in the preparation of his speeches. He thought on the subject night and day, sometimes committing the peroration and other important passages to memory, though in the main he trusted to the inspiration of the moment for the words in which to clothe his ideas."[24] His nephew, Charles McLaren, makes practically the same statement: "While much of his language was coined on the spot from a mind familiar with great English writers of verse or of prose, his arguments and illustrations, together with his perorations and many of his striking passages, were carefully composed and committed to paper in the form of elaborate notes."[25] Robertson adds the same general assertion as these others: "He examines the subject from all points of view, and after he has arrived at a final decision, he writes out the heads of the different thoughts, to recall the various views he intends to enumerate, and trusts to his command of language in the expressing of them."[26]

Conclusions can be drawn from Mr. Bright's statement and from these various authorities: (1) that he wrote out his arguments on slips of paper; (2) that he wrote in full and memorized his perorations; (3) that important passages and illustrations were often carefully worked out in his speech notes; and (4) that he could adapt himself to the situation and his audience since for the most part he left his words to come at call with delivery.

Again, the statement that the sheets of his speech were turned over to reporters can be very seriously challenged. For the most part it seems that his speeches were taken down in shorthand. This was true at least during the period when he was most successful. Drawing upon Mr. R. W. Dale, we gain this information: "Twenty years ago (Mr. Dale wrote his article on John Bright in 1889) three well-known Parliamentary reporters told me that Mr. Bright, Mr. Gladstone, and Mr. Disraeli were the only men in the House of

[23] Vince, C. A.: *John Bright*, p. 207, Blackie and Son, London, 1898.

[24] O'Brien, op. cit., p. 247.

[25] North American Review, Volume 155, September, 1892, p. 315, *Reminiscences of John Bright, by his Nephew, Charles McLaren.*

[26] Robertson, op. cit., p. 257.

Commons at that time whose speeches they could report verbatim. There were no formless sentences to complete or to reconstruct. The only kindly service which his speeches required from them was the elimination of an unnecessary 'now' or 'well now,' with which he occasionally began a sentence."[27] Robertson gives very conclusive evidence on this matter of shorthand reporting. In 1843, Mr. Joseph Pitman, the originator of that system of reporting, delivered a lecture on Phonography, or Pitman shorthand, in the Theatre, Toad Lane, in Rochdale. Mr. Bright who was the chairman, expressed his astonishment at the speed of Pitman. I here quote Robertson on the reporting of Mr. Bright's speeches by this method: "Although Mr. Bright at that period of his public career had a foresight of the great usefulness of phonography, he had no idea that it would be so greatly employed in recording his public utterances, and we may add that during his life he has seen more reporters congregated together than any other public man, for it has been no uncommon circumstance for fifty or sixty to attend public meetings when it has been known that he would be present."[28] Mr. Robertson continues with a comparison of the accuracy of reporters. Mr. Bright considered that his Manchester speeches, for instance, were reported much more accurately than those he gave in London. The reason advanced for this was that the reporters taking down the Manchester speeches had much more time to get their notes in shape before presenting the finished product at the London office.

A second conclusion, then, can be drawn that at least many of John Bright's speeches were transcribed from short-hand notes, rather than from his own hand-writing as would have had to be the case, since he never employed a secretary for his preparation.

Finally, there is the fact of the frequency of his addresses. The following table will indicate the quick succession of his speeches during the Corn Law tours of late 1842 and early 1843.

[27] Littell's Living Age, Volume 181, June 1, 1889, p. 547, *John Bright*, R. W. Dale.

[28] Robertson, op. cit., p. 154-156.

YEAR	MONTH	DAY	CITY
1842	November	18	Huddersfield
	"	21	Accrington
	"	29	Kendal
	December	1	Manchester
	"	2	Sunderland
	"	12	Rochdale
	"	13	Nottingham
	"	15	Holmfirth
	"	19	Preston
	"	23	South Staffordshire
	"	28	Manchester
	"	29	Dudley
	"	30	Stourbridge
1843	January	3	Birmingham
			Stirling
			Glasgow
			Hawick
			Newcastle-on-Tyne
	"	10	Lancaster
	"	12	Edinburgh
	"	23	Dundee
			Perth
	"	27	Manchester
	"	29	Ashton
	February	1	Manchester
	"	3	Manchester
	"	4	Manchester

With one appearance fairly dogging the heels of another, it is difficult to imagine that Mr. Bright was following the practice of writing out and memorizing a speech for each occasion. Of course, it is altogether possible that he used speeches over and over again, but it is more probable that he simply used the same ideas and re-worded the argument at each appearance. Not only did he speak five times in Manchester during these three months, but he also spoke in towns so closely located that auditors at one speech might easily have attended another. Such circumstances would have made a second use of a speech almost impossible and certainly unwise.

Finally, in refutation of the statement that most of John Bright's speeches were written out and memorized is the fact that he possessed quite marked extempore ability. In the main, of course, his speeches were prepared in that he outlined very carefully his arguments and prepared certain important passages, but he could make effective

extempore speeches. His famous defence of the Queen against the strictures of Mr. Ayrton, in St. James Hall in 1866, was given without the possibility of more than a few moments preparation.[29] Mr. Frederick Harrison himself is one of the most enthusiastic as to the power of that speech. "He sprang to his feet, and poured out a reproof in indignant eloquence, so full of pathos, generosity, and fine feeling that it electrified the audience. The meeting broke out into cheers (men for the most part suspicious of Government influence) and dispersed chanting 'God save the Queen.' And before I knew what had happened I found myself towards midnight marching up Regent Street arm in arm with a column of joiners and masons, shouting, 'God save the Queen!' "[30]

In 1877 Mr. Bright went to Bradford to assist in the unveiling of Cobden's statue. He was so borne down by the sadness of the task that he was unable to formulate what he would say until the morning on which he was to make his address. His whole speech he said came to him while he was dressing.[31]

In 1875 Mr. Bright spoke very eloquently, but without any previous preparation on the so-called Burials Bill and one of the churchmen present gave it as his opinion that he had "never heard a speech more full of pathetic beauty and power."[32] The Bill was introduced by its originator, Mr. O. Morgan, and an uninteresting debate back and forth among Gladstone, Roebuck, Newdegate, Forster and Cross almost emptied the House. Mr. Bright, however, was observed to take his pencil out of his pocket and make a few notes. The news that Bright was preparing to speak was soon communicated to the members absent in the tea room and the lobby with the result that when he rose to speak the House was practically full.[33]

The Burials Bills speech of 1875 was followed in 1880 by another on the same subject. As he walked into the division lobby afterwards, his friend, Mr. Pennington, remarked to him, "We—, Mr. Bright, you 'broke' the House tonight." Mr. Bright replied, "Well, I did not intend to speak at all."[34]

[29] Mills, Joseph Travis, p. 150, Edward Hicks, Jr., London, 1893.
[30] Harrison, op. cit., p. 304.
[31] Smith, op. cit., pp. 238-239.
[32] Mills, op. cit., p. 150.
[33] Robertson, op. cit., p. 479.
[34] O'Brien, op. cit., pp. 253-254.

Early in his speaking in the House he was "tried out" as it were. Various members attempted to divert his attention from his argument by putting questions to him in the course of his speech. He dealt with such interruptions so effectively that the members knew him as a dangerous man to interrupt.[35] He was constantly on the alert to detect weak points and strong points in a debate, so that he might contradict or eulogize them. As he listened he jotted down short notes on pieces of paper which were employed in the same way as his well prepared speech notes.[36]

We may briefly conclude from this consideration of preparation that for the most part Mr. Bright prepared his speeches; that preparation for him meant a well developed plan, but that aside from peroration and some illustrations, he did not prepare his exact words; and lastly, that he demonstrated quite marked ability in extempore speaking.

PRACTICAL, AESTHETIC, AND SCIENTIFIC ATTITUDES TOWARD PUBLIC SPEAKING

MILTON DICKENS AND R. L. SCHANCK
Syracuse University

THERE is a story told of how a poet, an engineer, and a geologist stood looking at a mountain. "A sleeping giant!" exclaimed the poet. "There's thirty kilowatts of potential electricity in that water, if a man could only make a dam hold at the end of that natural lake," said the engineer. The geologist, meanwhile, was busy writing his analysis, "Niagara limestone on a basalt formation, a serious rock fault, the whole thing of Silurian origin." All were looking at the same object, but each saw it differently.

The above point might well be put into psychological language: the attitude of the observer determines both the direction, the perspective, and the light in which he views the object before him. "Attitudes" are, perhaps, best defined as motor sets or tendencies to respond in a given way under given circumstances. There appear to be three possible attitudes which one may take toward any phe-

[35] O'Brien, op. cit., p. 106.
British Quarterly Review, Volume 48, July-October, 1869, p. 200.
[36] Robertson, op. cit., p. 567.

nomenon: the aesthetic, the practical, the scientific. These types are illustrated by the story above. Professor R. M. Ogden has stated, "There should be nothing in all human experience toward which one cannot maintain an aesthetic attitude."[1] It could be added—or toward which one cannot maintain a practical or scientific attitude.

Public speaking is a field containing phenomena toward which people can and do maintain all three of the attitudes suggested. The success or failure of any public speech is likely to depend upon the attitudes involved, both on the part of the speaker and the listeners. An illustration may help to make this statement clearer. Two years ago, in an extemporaneous speaking contest one of the competitors was ranked first, third, and ninth by the three judges. Because of the wide variation in judgments, each judge was asked to explain his reasons for his ranking of the speaker in question. The judge who had placed him first (a lawyer) said that the speaker had done most toward convincing him of the truth of the message of the speech; the judge who had placed him third (a public speaking professor) said that the speaker had ranked high, but not best, in his estimation because of various features connected with the construction of the speech, the bodily movement, voice, diction, et cetera; the judge who had placed him ninth (a teacher of interpretation) said that she felt the speech entirely lacked all literary quality and artistic finish. It will be seen that the lawyer took a practical attitude toward the speakers; the speech professor took a scientific, analytical attitude; the interpretation teacher took an aesthetic attitude. We may thus say that in terms of the listeners, the success of a speech is likely to hinge upon the attitudes involved. Reversing this statement, we may say that the success of the speaker often depends upon his ability at predicting and meeting the attitudes of his listeners; or upon his ability at building attitudes among his hearers which will correspond with his attitude.

It would seem advisable to consider the problem from the speaker's standpoint in somewhat greater detail. What are the qualities of a practical speech? The characteristics of this approach are the clearest of the three. In a practical speech, the speaker's purpose is to control and manipulate the behavior of his audience. The essential mechanisms involved may be more easily understood

[1] The Aesthetic Attitude, *Journal of Philosophy*, 1905, pp. 411-412.

by analyzing the following illustration. A large ape in a certain experiment was caged with smaller monkeys. For several days bananas were thrown into the cage. On the first day, the ape succeeded in taking possession of the bananas, but only after a considerable struggle in which teeth were bared and several of the contestants wounded. After this process had been repeated a few times, the ape found that he needed only to bare his fangs and show other signs of rage in order to drive off the smaller monkeys. By means of a process of conditioning, it became no longer necessary actually to fight because the substitute stimuli of growls, snarls, and facial grimaces were found adequate to produce the desired results. The ape was thus provided with a method by which he was able to control the behavior of his fellows to the better satisfaction of his own biological needs.[2] Among human beings, the process has been considerably refined, but is not essentially different. The lawyer, salesman, preacher, and statesman are interested in the possibilities of speech as a method of control and it is probably safe to assume that a fair share of public speaking students take the work with this end in vew.

Langfeld points out that if one enters an art gallery and finds a statue with outstretched hand and in surprise extends his own hand under a misapprehension that the statue wants to shake hands, such a reaction is not one of artistic appreciation. If, however, one stretches one's arm *with* the arm of the statue in order to feel the full value of the lines, such a movement is in harmony with the rest of the statue as intended by the sculptor.[3] In the first instance, we have an example of the practical attitude; in the second, we have the aesthetic. It will be seen that we have now left the field of bread and butter interests and are endeavoring to enjoy in the facts of life a sense of harmony, proportion, and balance. When we change our attitude from practical to aesthetic with reference to a speech, we throw aside our desire to control the actions of our audience and attempt only the creation and enjoyment of something beautiful. Drama and interpretative reading are activities which exist primarily for aesthetic pleasure. Here a new relationship between speaker and audience is found to have developed. As

[2] The substance of this illustration is taken from Wolfgang Koehler's experiments and reports.

[3] Langfeld, H. M.: *The Aesthetic Attitude*

opposed to the practical situation where the speaker tries to achieve direct contact with his hearers, we now strive to develop a situation where the persons comprising the audience maintain an attitude of detachment and non-participation. Dr. Bulloch calls this aesthetic distance. If this is broken by either audience or players, the consequences are distasteful. Once during a showing of *Othello,* a member of the audience became so excited that, during the scene in which Othello murders Desdemona, he sprang to his feet and rushed to the platform to stop the murder. Turning from audience to player, we may again illustrate failure to maintain aesthetic distance by citing the frequent cases where a player forgets his lines and in despair goes "out of character" to look apologetically at his audience.

Having now considered some of the characteristics of both the practical and the aesthetic attitudes toward speech, we may turn to the third possible approach, the scientific. The spirit of pure science is neither practical nor artistic, but aims at exact description and critical analysis. Speech students and teachers will be likely to maintain this attitude in courses such as speech reëducation, voice training, speech psychology, and the like. As one examines the scientific attitude toward public speaking, it seems clear that here again there is a dual aspect: (1) there may be a scientific attitude toward the speaker's method, i.e., a voice teacher critically analyzing the voice of a student during the latter's speech; (2) there may be a scientific attitude toward the ideas being conveyed by means of speech, i.e., members of a scientific organization critically analyzing the experimental findings of a member who is making an oral report.

It appears possible that a speaker might apply all three of the attitudes we have described to a given speech or reading. For example, suppose a teacher of oral interpretation decides to read a poem to his class for purposes of instruction. He may go home and leaf through a book in search of an appropriate selection. Upon finding the poem he wants, he may sit down and read it aloud to himself in order to enjoy the beauty of it. Charmed by his own reading, he may smile or shed tears. He is maintaining an aesthetic attitude toward his reading. Next day, he reads the poem to his class, stopping at various points, perhaps, to call attention to some significant inflection or necessary emphasis. His attitude is now primarily scientific or analytic. Then let us suppose that he reads a stanza and

calls upon a student to reproduce it. He has now become practical and is trying to influence the behavior of his listeners.

It should be noted that our distinctions between the practical, aesthetic, and scientific attitudes have been couched in teleological or purposive terms. The distinctions cannot be made in purely motor terms. Psychology and biology know of no muscles or glands of aesthetic appreciation as distinguished from those of practical adjustment or scientific analysis. Observation of a man's overt movements often gives us no clue as to what his attitude is. The only way we can classify his reaction is by finding out his purpose. This point may be clarified by considering a definite case of the relationship between overt movement and covert purpose. Men run for many different reasons. They run to catch trains. They run to get out of the path of an approaching auto. They run for exercise. They run races. From what is now known on the subject, it appears that the same muscles and joints are used in each of the above situations. Simply observing the movements of a running man gives us no basis for classification. However, if we can discover his purpose, a classification in teleological terms is possible. Such a classification seems entirely justified and useful.

Unless a speaker knows whether he is attempting to control human behavior to the better satisfaction of his own purposes, or performing and creating an artistic piece of work, or presenting a scientific analysis, there can be only confusion and failure of purpose. A number of actual cases may help to make the practical application of this thesis clearer. (1) A public speaking professor recently related a personal incident of the following nature: he was assisting in an endowment drive and developed a "beautiful" speech which drew an average of 67c per person from audiences where it was presented; he revised the speech in terms of applied psychology and discovered that his average rose to $1.37 per person. It will be seen that in his earlier speech, he had a mixture of the aesthetic and the practical. In his latter speech, he eliminated some of the aesthetic in favor of the more practical. The results of this change were attested in dollars and cents. His first speech was apparently developed without any clear analysis of his purposes. It was undoubtedly an excellent effort and probably impressed his hearers favorably as an artistic piece of work. As his delayed analysis showed, however, he was after all not speaking to arouse aesthetic appreciation among his

listeners, but was trying to get them to contribute money for the endowment funds. (2) There was a public speaking instructor doing graduate work in science who was asked to make an oral report before a group of scientists in the field of his study. Although an excellent speaker, this man read practically the entire paper. There was no gesture, no emotional appeal, no particular variation of voice, almost no directness. Upon being asked why he had given his report in this colorless fashion, he replied, "Those men would have resented any attempt which even resembled good public speaking in the ordinary sense of the words. They were not interested in hearing anything artistic and they would have been antagonized by the slightest suspicion that I was trying to 'sell' them something. I thought the best policy would be to present my material in as colorless a fashion as possible." This analysis might be restated in terms of attitudes: his audience was not interested in aesthetic material; they would have been antagonized by practical material; their attitude was entirely scientific. One might say that the best public speaking in such a situation consists in breaking all the commonly accepted rules of best public speaking. (3) Some years ago the preacher of a certain church devoted most of his sermons to the purely emotional or the purely educational. One sermon, for example, consisted in a lecture-recital of poetry. Another comprised a book review. The first of these two sermons was mostly interpretation; the second was mostly intellectual analysis. There was a total absence of appeals to join the church or forgo sin. Upon being questioned about this, he said, "Every member of my congregation is a member of the church. Their contributions to the work of the church are at present entirely adequate for our needs. So far as I know they are entirely convinced that it is better to live uprightly than sinfully. I see no reason why I should appeal to them to join the church, contribute money, or live straight. I believe that my best service to them lies in giving them the beautiful and in trying to educate them to new ideas." This preacher was saying that there is no use making a practical appeal to get people to do that which they have already done. Therefore, he gave mainly aesthetic or scientific sermons. This seems to have been a creditable analysis of his situation. (4) Near a small mid-western town is a famous old cemetery. Here annual Memorial Day services, including speaking, are held. One year, a prominent lawyer and politician was invited to deliver the

address of the day. After a few preliminary remarks, the speaker began working into a discussion of politics and ended up in what was clearly a political harangue. Many of his listeners were disgusted. He was not asked to speak there again. The next year a lesser known individual was invited to speak. He gave a purely aesthetic speech, arousing beautiful emotions about the occasion and about the heroic dead. The speech did not accomplish anything so far as getting action from his audience was concerned, nor did it contain any important thoughts, but it did arouse pleasant emotions. He was immediately requested to give another speech the following year. We might analyze the above case as follows: the lawyer made a practical speech in a situation where the attitudes of his hearers were not prepared for it; the other speaker presented only aesthetic material and satisfied the mental set of his hearers perfectly.

The above cases show the practical importance of correctly analyzing the attitudes involved in any given public speaking situation. Some of the above subjects who made successful speeches, did so in a trial-and-error fashion; some actually analyzed their problems in advance. General observation appears to show that the trial-and-error method is in greater usage. This tendency on the part of students and speakers which leads them to skip over the important problem of "aiming the speech in the right direction" and go at once to a consideration of details, is a problem which the writers feel has not received sufficient study. An understanding and application of what is known about the practical, aesthetic, and scientific attitudes of human beings as they relate to speech situations, might prove a tangible and useful method for emphasizing the necessity of deciding upon one's purpose before proceeding further with plans for any public speech.

PUBLIC SPEAKING AND PUBLIC OPINION

DAYTON D. McKEAN
Princeton University

THE voice of the people may be the voice of God, or of Satan, or of something in between, what Sir Robert Peel called "that great compound of wrong feeling, right feeling, obstinacy, and newspaper paragraphs which is called public opinion." Whosesoever voice it may be, it speaks as one having authority; statesmen, newspaper

editors, preachers, managers of utility companies, college presidents, all listen attentively. Even the Supreme Court, as Mr. Dooley said, follows the election returns. There is not now, and never has been, a government which could long exist against a concerted public opinion; a government may control or direct or mislead public opinion, but it dare not defy it. Nowadays governments are supersensitive to this unseen force, so sensitive indeed that politicians frequently display little initiative or independence. As Speaker Cannon said of President McKinley, he "kept his ear so close to the ground that it frequently got full of grasshoppers."

From the time of the Greek democracies to the New England town meeting, the public speaker was the acknowledged leader of public opinion, and a man had indeed little chance of political success unless he was a good speaker. The history of oratory is one long account of the issues upon which public opinion was formed from age to age, and we cannot understand the oratory of any period unless we understand the issues and opinions of the times. It is only because we often lack this complete knowledge that the reading of past oratory is dull.

In the history of the United States—although in a phase as yet incompletely studied—it is recognized that Webster, Clay, Calhoun, Phillips, Lincoln, Douglas, and all the rest of the great speakers of the nineteenth century were leaders of American public opinion. Many of them owed their influence almost entirely to their ability to speak. A few men, like Jefferson, attained wide influence without this ability, but they felt the lack of it in an age when public decisions were reached in the forum.

It is alleged that conditions are so changed that public opinion is now formed by agencies other than the speaker, notably by newspapers. Recent studies of public opinion give full treatment to newspapers, schools, literature, the movies, even to music, but pass over public speaking as if it belonged to a past and primitive day. A very small amount of investigation, however, will convince any one that thousands of speeches are being made in this country every day; and surely the thousands of speakers have some hope that they will affect the conduct of those who listen, or else they would seek employment in newspaper work, or they would put their messages into pamphlet form. Even if there is no Webster thundering in the

Senate, the great number of speeches made cannot but have great influence upon the opinions of those who listen.

Although the power of public opinion has long been recognized, and although speakers since time began have sought to influence it, analysis of what public opinion is, how it is formed, and what it will do has never been completely successful. Perhaps there will never be a definitive treatment of the subject, for an opinion is an idea, and an idea cannot be explained or described—aside from figurative analogies—except by or in terms of another idea. Walter Lippmann, whose study of public opinion has had wide influence, went back to Plato for an analogy; he thinks of opinions as stereotypes, as "pictures in our heads."[1] Hence, public opinion is the total of such pictures, or it is the stereotype held by a large enough group to constitute a public. The behaviorists take a similar view: "The term public opinion usually signifies some conviction, belief or sentiment common to all or to a great majority. . . . Public opinion is merely the collection of individual opinions. It has no existence except in individual minds."[2] It is true, of course, that public opinion can exist only in the minds of those who form the public, but writers often use terms like "the public mind" or "the group mind." Such expressions are not misleading as long as it is clearly recognized that a group cannot possess any consciousness apart from that of the individuals composing it. The individuals in a group receive different stimuli and their resulting reactions are consequently different.

Some writers would not include all opinions held by the people who compose a public, even if such opinions are held by a large majority. They would insist that the opinion must be one clearly open to argument, not a sentiment or emotion. But the sentimental or emotional basis of an opinion cannot be separated from it, and one term must be used for all the convictions, beliefs, and sentiments widely held. A public opinion need not refer to any action upon which governmental action is possible. It should never be confused with the means used for its expression.

The explanations of the sources of the opinions in the individuals composing the public vary with the schools of psychology and sociology, some stressing environment and some heredity. The behavior-

[1]Lippmann, Walter: *Public Opinion*, Chap. I.
[2]Allport, Floyd: *Social Psychology*, p. 395.

ists like John Locke, think of the mind as a *tabula rasa,* on which anything may be written by environment. The other group insists that we are born with certain instincts that exert a strong influence upon our behavior. Le Bon goes so far as to speak of instinctive tendencies in certain races.[3] Perhaps the truth lies somewhere between these two views: we are born with certain instincts, aptitudes, or tendencies; but these are modified by environment, especially by training, and the resultant opinions are changed and changed again all our lives long.

In the formation of public opinion, not all opinions are of the same weight. The writers trained in political science insist that the opinion of one man, if he is the right man, will outweigh that of ten thousand others.[4] This is true at least in the formation of opinion, but when any attempt is made to weigh or estimate opinion such crude methods as the number who vote or subscribe or enlist must be used. President Lowell, for this reason, thinks that the majority opinion of those voting—a number which may represent a very small minority of the conceivable public opinion—must, for all practical purposes, be taken as public opinion. A necessary corollary is that the minority must acquiesce.

An old question in the formation of opinion is that of whether the group receive their opinions from the leaders or whether the leaders receive theirs from the group. Professor Munro points to the leadership of certain men to show that their opinions go to form public opinion.[5] Probably it works both ways. Woodrow Wilson, who certainly had distinct opinions of his own, once said, "I have the most imperfect means of finding out (what the people are thinking) and yet I have got to act as if I knew. . . . I am not here to do as I please."[6] But he never hesitated, when he thought he was right, to try to bring public opinion around to his way of thinking.

Nothing is more characteristic of public opinion than its tendency to change. The stereotypes, or prepotent reflexes, or whatever we call them, which we hold are constantly being altered, some rapidly,

[3] Le Bon, G., *The Crowd,* p. 43.

[4] See, for example, Bryce, Viscount J.: *Modern Democracies,* II, Chap. XV, and Lowell, A. L.: *Public Opinion in War and Peace,* Chap. I.

[5] Munro, W. B.: *Personality in Politics.*

[6] Address before the National Press Club, May 15, 1916, printed in *Selected Literary and Political Papers and Addresses of Woodrow Wilson,* II, p. 160.

some slowly. Our forefathers were profoundly convinced that witchcraft was a very real and ever-present danger, and that the way to check its malignant influence was to burn old women. We regard that opinion as a strange and horrible superstition. Our great grandfathers believed that the less government the better, but the manifold activities of government today testify, whatever our public pronouncements, how far we have abandoned that opinion. There was, ten years ago, an overwhelming opinion in favor of prohibition; now, if there is not a majority opinion opposed to it, there is a very vociferous minority. The public opinions about marriage, divorce, birth control, collectivism, war and peace, and many others are shifting all the time; and within a few years, as a result of constant public discussion, we may expect more stable opinions to be formed on certain of these subjects.

It will almost go without saying that there are important vested interests in the maintenance of certain public opinions. Mr. Rockefeller has a distinct financial interest in any public opinion about the oil industry; the Du Pont family is very much affected by any public opinion about war, as the Krupp family was in Germany; Messrs. Doherty and Insull have great fortunes to gain or lose, depending upon public opinion about utilities, and so on. Even college professors owe their livelihoods to a public opinion favorable to the subjects they teach, and, indirectly, to higher education in general.

These interests may utilize one or several means of influencing public opinion in their behalf, and ordinarily more than one means is used, so that it is very difficult to ascribe to the various factors their due proportion of the final result. Take, for instance, a typical "drive," say for a community hospital. The end in view is to arouse in the people of the community a public opinion of sufficient intensity to induce them to contribute. The committee in charge, or perhaps the professional organizer, will use every possible method. Newspapers will publish editorials, advertisements, and leading stories about the progress of the drive. Placards will be nailed on fences; street cars will carry banners. At mass meetings, in moving picture theatres, churches, and schools the public will be urged to contribute by all the speakers that the committee can command. By all available means public opinion will be beseiged, and if an opinion of sufficient strength is aroused, the drive will be successful. But at

the end it will be impossible to say exactly what force had what amount of influence.

In this paper I wish to discuss public speaking as one of the many means used in influencing public opinion today by showing to what extent and with what ascertainable results it is used by certain contemporary interests. It should then be possible to draw some conclusions as to its general effectiveness.

In turning first to the use of public speaking in governmental propaganda, it should be said that ethics of the problem, however interesting, do not concern us here; we are interested in the methods used. A clear-cut example of the use of public speaking in propaganda was furnished in the last war. Mr. George Creel, as chairman of the Committee on Public Information, had charge of American propaganda. He has told the story of the work of the committee in his book *How We Advertised America*. The title of the book, like the name of his committee, is somewhat misleading, but the book itself is a first-rate account of how it is possible to regiment the public mind, conditioning the reflexes of a hundred million people so that they will all respond alike to certain words such as "Hun" or to certain things, such as flags or uniforms. This drilling of people's minds is absolutely necessary in modern warfare, for as Ludendorff once remarked, wars are no longer won by armies in the field, but by the morale of the whole people. Be it said in passing that American public opinion has not yet recovered fully from the effects of the wartime regimentation.

The speaking activities of the Committee on Public Information were divided into two parts. One division obtained and sent out speakers. Sometimes these men were returned soldiers, especially foreign ones who had been decorated for bravery, or they were foreign notables; but the greater number were Americans who had had experience in public speaking. "A card catalogue of over ten thousand speakers and makers of opinion was eventually gathered, and a select list of over three hundred speakers. Whenever a request was made for an individual address, a list was prepared of those available for such service."[7] When requests were not made the committee provided the occasion; they "arranged mass-meetings in the communities, conducted forty-five war conferences from coast to

[7] Creel, George: *How We Advertised America*, p. 150.

coast, co-ordinated the entire speaking activities of the nation, and assured consideration to the crossroads hamlet as well as to the city."[8]

The second and larger division of the work was that of the so-called Four Minute Men, a group of civilians who originally made four-minute speeches in moving picture theatres, lodges, clubs, labor unions, churches, granges, synagogues, Sunday Schools, and anywhere else where they had a ready-made audience which would listen for four minutes. In 153 colleges, according to Mr. Creel, groups were organized and spoke to their student bodies and to student organizations. A junior movement was started in the lower schools where the teacher explained from week to week the subjects sent out by the committee. Then, using bulletins provided by the committee, the pupils wrote bellicose little speeches. This, Mr. Creel assures us, "had real educational value."

Before the end of the war the Four Minute Men had been fashioned into a stupendous propaganda group. They were thoroughly organized with state units under the national committee, and county and city units under the state. The size of the organization became enormous: "The Four Minute Men. . . . commanded the volunteer services of 75,000 speakers, operating in 5,200 communities, and making a total of 755,190 speeches."[9] It was hardly necessary for Mr. Creel to say, in view of such a barrage of oratory, that "the importance of the spoken word was not underestimated."

To this army of speakers the committee sent out canned material for preparing speeches, and even sent out fully prepared speeches. For a while these were written by Mr. Waldo P. Warren of Chicago, and later by Mr. E. T. Gundlach, head of a Chicago advertising agency. All the Four Minute Men were supposed to discuss the same topic, as supplied by the committee, week by week. The topics were vague, open to perfervid oratory, for instance, "What Our Enemy Really Is," "Onward to Victory," "The Danger to Democracy," or "The Meaning of America."

Mr. Creel gives high praise to the effectiveness of the Four Minute Men as a means of arousing the war spirit. Through them, he says, it was easiest "to arouse the nation swiftly and effectively." He estimates the press publicity value of the speeches at $750,000,

[8] Creel, op. cit., p. 6.
[9] Creel, op. cit., p. 7.

a figure which he admits is very modest. It may be said in summary that the Four Minute Men was one of the most powerful organs of propaganda ever devised.

To turn from the wartime use of public speaking in the formation of public opinion, take the use that political parties make of speaking in a campaign. Parties, like other groups interested in influencing opinion, do not rely upon any one means of doing it. Among legitimate methods they use posters, newspaper advertising, pamphlets, the campaign textbook, and speeches by and for the candidates. Within the national committee there is set up a speakers' bureau which, in addition to the headquarters in Washington, may have branches in three or four other cities, depending upon the expected development of the campaign. In 1920 the Republican National Committee used 15,000 speakers in addition to the number engaged in state and local campaigns.[10] These speakers are usually unpaid, except for expense money. They contribute their services with a view, perhaps, to their advancement in the party. Included in the number of speakers are senators, representatives, former candidates, cabinet members, governors, and prominent members of the party. If a party can boast of a living ex-President, they are glad to obtain his services.

Several candidates for President have made extensive tours of the country, speaking directly to the voters, letting themselves be seen and heard. It is only when the party's managers feel sure of success, as the Republicans were in 1920 and 1924, that they can avoid the expense of the speaking tour by the candidate. For the last thirty-five years, except during Wilson's campaigns, the Democratic Party, being in the minority, has had to send its candidates on speaking tours. But even when a party is fairly sure of election, it feels that it must have its candidate make speeches every week or two during the campaign. Not only does the candidate reach the audience directly before him, but through the newspapers, his speeches reach many more people. The opinion formed during a campaign is very largely made from speeches, directly or indirectly. As Job Hedges once said, "The man who hires the hall is the man who makes public opinion."

[10] Sait, E. M.: *American Parties and Elections*, p. 500.

Politicians of late have turned to the radio as a quick and convenient means of reaching larger audiences than a speaker can, face-to-face. It is true that there is a gigantic potential audience—perhaps fifteen to twenty millions—but the radio audience is not equivalent to the same number in groups, addressed by the candidate in person. The people are not seated, facing the speaker, so that he is sure of getting continuous attention; they are, rather, scattered in thousands of homes, reading the evening paper, playing bridge, washing the dinner dishes, or playing with the children. Another great difficulty facing the radio speaker is that science has not yet advanced to the point where it can make pleasant the reproduced sound of the human voice. At best it is tiresome; at worst it is intolerable. Some good public speakers, like Alfred E. Smith, do not make good radio speakers, and may even make a distinctly bad impression upon their hearers, for all the personality of a speaker, except that which can be conveyed by voice alone, is lost. In spite of all these disadvantages, political parties seem to be using the radio address more and more in each campaign, probably because of the huge potential audience. When we consider the radio address and all the other kinds of speeches used by political parties, we must conclude that they still depend upon public speaking as their main means of influencing public opinion.

Of late years a new profession has grown up in the United States, that of public relations counsel. These men, who will undertake for a fee to manufacture public opinion for any one interested, insist that they are not publicity agents or advertising men, although the distinction seems a little unreal.[11] Mr. Ivy L. Lee and Mr. Edward L. Bernays are two outstanding men in this so-called profession. It is a bit humiliating to a good democrat to read what they have been able to do in creating public opinion for a client.[12] There was a time when the very name, John D. Rockefeller, symbolized to the public all that was cold, calculating and unscrupulous in American business. That was in the days when Ida M. Tarbell's *History of the Standard Oil Company* was widely read. But Mr. Ivy Lee has had charge of Mr. Rockefeller's public relations for some years and has achieved

[11] See Lee, Ivy L., *"Publicity and Propaganda,"* an address reprinted in Graves, W. B., *Readings in Public Opinion*, pp. 577-584.

[12] Bernays, E. L.: *Crystallizing Public Opinion* and *Propaganda*, and Long, J. C.: *Public Relations*.

for his client a perfect whitewashing. Fascinating as the story is, it does not belong here; we are interested in how a private individual may use public speaking in producing a favorable public opinion for his client. Mr. Bernays has been most explicit:

> "The lecture platform still retains its place for the public relations counsel. . . . the public relations counsel can, for instance, suggest to his client to secure a prominent person, who because of interest in a cause will gladly undertake a lecture tour. . . . The tours of prominent authors are arranged by publishers in their behalf.
>
> Then there is the lecture tour managed by the client himself and arranged through the booking of engagements with such local groups as might be interested in assuming sponsorship for what he said. A soap company might engage a lecturer on cleanliness to speak in the schools of leading communities. Or a woolen firm arrange for a home economics authority to lecture to women's clubs on dress. These speakers of course locally gain a wider audience than the speaker would who addresses a single meeting because they give opportunity for treatment in newspapers, advertizing, and other mediums.
>
> The lecture field offers another means of communication inasmuch as it gives the public relations counsel a range of group leaders to whom he can furnish the facts and ideas that he is trying to propagate . . .
>
> The meeting or public demonstration, at which prominent speakers voice their views upon the particular problem or problems at issue would quite naturally fall under this same classification. Its main purpose, of course, is not so much to reach the audience being addressed as to make a focal point of interest to those thousands and millions who do not attend, but who get the reverberations of the speaker's voice through other mediums than their own auditory sensations."[13]

Somewhat the same sort of work as that done by the public relations counsel in molding public opinion is that of a pressure group, such as the Anti-Saloon League, the Lord's Day Alliance, the National Security League, the Citizens' Union, the English-Speaking Union, and many others.[14] These are all groups which seek to build up a particular public opinion, and all of them make

[13] Bernays, E. L., Crystallizing Public Opinion, pp. 201-203.

[14] See, for example, Odegard, Peter: *Pressure Politics;* and Steuart, J.: *Wayne Wheeler, Dry Boss*, especially chapters II and III.

use of speakers and lecturers. Some are engaged in lobbying for or against a certain measure, one group often opposing another. But before any organization can get its measures enacted into law it must arouse a favorable public opinion. The use of speakers has been found to be the best, and often the only way in which a minority group can reach the public, for the newspapers may be hostile to their cause, and newspaper advertising is expensive. The National Security League has sufficient funds to buy broadcasting time for radio speakers, but most propaganda groups must send speakers out to audiences. The Anti-Saloon League had thousands of speakers who went all over the country, attacking the saloon and the liquor interests. The League never got very enthusiastic support from the newspapers of the country, and most of the favorable opinion they aroused came as a result of their speaking campaigns.

The church is one of the most important groups seeking to influence public opinion, and the most important means used by churches is public speaking. The United States Census of Religious Bodies listed 232,154 churches in 1926, with a total membership of 54,576,346. Here is both a public, composed of nearly half the population, and also a wealthy and powerful group seeking to mold public opinion. If the church were not divided into some 240 denominations, it would be the most powerful single influence upon public opinion. But as it is, the various groups often advocate opposite policies. The churches are interested in legislation affecting schools, such as the anti-evolution bills and acts requiring the reading of the Bible, and they are also the most important advocates of sumptuary legislation, such as prohibition and Sunday closing. Although the church in the United States may not contain at the present time preachers equal to those it has produced in the past, the sheer number of the preachers who address their congregations at least once a week is most impressive. A quarter of a million speeches a week to half the population cannot but influence public opinion. There are, in addition, a few preachers, like Harry Emerson Fosdick, who are able in themselves to attract a large following.

A private corporation, especially a public utilities corporation, may wish for various reasons to obtain a favorable public opinion. Advertising in newspapers and magazines with this purpose is called "good will advertising." The electric light and power companies are very much afraid of the bogey of public ownership, and they are

willing to spend vast sums every year to maintain a public opinion opposed to it. Like other interests, they have on occasion used public speaking to help to influence public opinion in the direction they desired. In 1925 and 1926 the National Electric Light Association undertook a campaign of propaganda against public ownership. It was reported in 1926 that they had speakers who made 9,508 talks before a total audience of 1,249,298.[15] That number of people is an appreciable fraction of the total population of the United States. The speakers were either employees of the utilities companies or hired lecturers, some of them college professors. The association found this method very effective and reported "splendid progress" in obtaining the opinion they wanted. The progress and the campaign were both stopped by a Congressional investigation; we are not interested in the motives but in the methods of the campaign.

These examples of the use of public speaking in molding public opinion do not begin to cover the whole field. In trade union meetings, university extension lectures, lyceums, chautauquas, chambers of commerce, women's clubs, luncheon clubs, and in thousands of other places every day people assemble to hear speeches, and these speeches, unless they are merely amusing, influence the public opinion of the country. It may safely be said that there never was more speaking going on in the United States than there is today; and it is, therefore, reasonable to suppose that the influence of public speaking is as great as it ever was.

The speaker, indeed, has certain advantages in persuasion that men who try to mold public opinion in other ways do not have. In the first place he gets continuous attention from his audience for the period of his speech, an attention which a newspaper or magazine may not get. If he has anything of general interest or importance to say, he will get the attention of the newspapers afterward. The speaker, moreover, gets an intensity of attention from his hearers that the average reader does not give to his newspaper, for the people are all seated, facing the speaker, and, if he is good enough, he can hold their complete attention. And when an opinion is to be formed on a rather complicated matter, a speaker, a candidate, for example, can get a full hour or more of the attention of his hearers,

[15] *Proceedings of the National Electric Light Association*, 1926, vol. 83, pp. 369-373.

when the same people would not plow through the columns in a newspaper necessary to give the same treatment to the subject. Besides these advantages, a speaker may use what Aristotle called ethical persuasion—the persuasion of his presence, his reputation, or his personality.

The unique persuasive value of public speaking in the formation of opinion may be shown in a negative way. The tendency of oppressors or of those who feel their power somewhat insecure to cut off free speech is in itself very strong evidence of the importance of public speaking in the making of public opinion. In time of war, even before press censorship is imposed, freedom of speech is curbed. The more closely a government feels itself pressed, the more severely it restricts free speech in the hope that an unfavorable opinion will also be repressed, if not prevented. In war time a citizen must think with the government, or if he does not, he must not think out loud. When the great government of the United States cannot permit a ragged agitator to speak on a street corner, it places altogether too flattering an estimate upon his ability to mold public opinion; but such has been its practice.

THE RELATION OF LANGUAGE TO THOUGHT

SIBYL MANDELL
University of Vienna

"Language is a perpetual orphic song,
Which rules with Daedal harmony a throng
Of thoughts and forms, which else senseless
and shapeless were."[1]

THE social aspect of language is so obvious as to be practically self-evident. At the risk of mentioning the superfluous it may be interesting to know that Adler has said: "Speech has an enormously important value in the development of the human soul. Logical thinking is possible only with a premise of speech. . . . . The fashioning of concepts is not a private matter, but concerns all society. . . . . Thoughts and concepts . . . . have their origin in the social

[1] Jespersen, Otto: *Language, Its Nature, Development, and Origin;* Allen and Unwin, 1922, p. 442.

life of man."[2] "Social stimulation and response," says Allport, "lie at the very root of language . . . . social control must be recognized as a potent factor in the origin of language."[3] Paget opens his preface by calling to our attention that, in one of its practical aspects, speech is a means for communicating and recording ideas."[4] "All life," says Henry James, "comes back to the question of our speech, the medium through which we communicate with each other . . . ."[5] Woodworth says that "when the individual is thinking alone he is apt to have a social situation in the back of his mind, . . ." and furthermore, he speaks of the close communication between language and thought, to be discussed later.[6]

In the light of this fundamental truth, any fact which throws light upon the nature of language is pertinent to the problems of social psychology. Moreover, inasmuch as a given consideration clarifies the explanation of the behavior of an individual, it pertains to the group of which that individual is an integral part.

That there is a close connection between language and thought has probably never—certainly not to our knowledge—been denied by any psychologist. But to the modern psychologist language probably assumes a more important role in the whole mechanism of thinking than ever before. It is true that Woodworth states that for thousands of years some psychologist or other has claimed the identity of language and thought.[7] Unfortunately, contrary to his usual scholarly procedure, Professor Woodworth does not specify, and the cursory glance which our time has permitted us to give to the writings of the ancients on this subject has not, as yet, revealed much which bears out Woodworth's doubtlessly authentic statement. It is true that Aristotle opens his *Treatise on Rhetoric* with the statement that "Rhetoric is the counterpart of logic";[8] and that Zeno (356-264 B.C.) quotes the Stoics as saying that the mind is divisible into eight parts and that "the five organs of sensation, and the vocal

[2] Adler, Alfred: *Understanding Human Nature;* Greenberg, 1927, p. 31.
[3] Allport, Floyd H.: *Social Psychology;* Houghton Mifflin, 1924, p. 194.
[4] Paget, Richard: *Human Speech, Kegan Paul* (Harcourt Brace), 1930, p. XIII.
[5] James, Henry: *The Question of Our Speech;* Houghton Mifflin, 1905.
[6] Woodworth, Robert S.: *Psychology;* Holt, 1929, p. 442.
[7] Woodworth, Robert S.: ibid.; p. 442.
[8] Aristotle: *Rhetoric* (Transl. by Buckley); Bell, 1883, p. 1.

power, and the intellectual power which is the mind itself, and the generative power, are all parts of the mind."[9]

The names of those who make a close connection between language and thought are myriad. Early in the eighteenth century George Bishop Berkeley, wrote his *New Theory of Vision* in which he stated that "No sooner do we hear the words of a familiar language pronounced in our ears but the ideas corresponding thereto present themselves to our minds:".[10] Coming to the end of the nineteenth century, when the old faculty psychology was still in vogue we find Sully stating in a teachers' handbook that "Language, being the medium by which we convey our impressions and express our thoughts one to another, plays a conspicuous part as a suggestive force."[11] thereby expressing clearly the current concept of language as a kind of a channel for thought. Spencer, writing in the last decade of the nineteenth century, claims that our intellectual operations are mostly confined to "the visual feelings" and "to the auditory feelings (as integrated into words)".[12] Writing at about the same time, Stout, in his *Analytic Psychology*, speaks of language as a "tool for thinking." In his *Manual of Psychology* the same author says, "Ideational activity would seem . . . . to be a prior condition of the existence of language. In logical strictness this is so, but it is equally true that ideational thinking could only exist in a most rudimentary and inchoate form apart from the use of some kind of expressive signs. Language is not merely an accompaniment of ideational activity; it is an instrument essential to development." He also states that the "psychical function which is involved in the use of language is conceptual analysis and synthesis."[13] Murphy calls our attention to the fact that "the relation of language to thought occupied many of the associationists," and calls particular attention to Taine in 1870.[14]

[9] Rand, Benjamin: *The Classical Psychologists;* Houghton Mifflin, 1912, p. 86.

[10] Rand, Benjamin: ibid.; p. 267.

[11] Sully, James: *"Teachers Handbook of Psychology";* Appleton, 1886, p. 143.

[12] Spencer, Herbert: *The Principles of Psychology;* Appleton, 1896, p. 187.

[13] Stout, G. F.: *Manual of Psychology;* Hinds and Noble, 1899, pp. 462, 464.

[14] Murphy, Gardner: *An Historical Introduction to Modern Psychology;* Harcourt Brace, 1929, p. 272.

Many books on child study which have been made either as a study of childhood, as such, or to throw light on the development of mentality as a whole have been written with a presupposition of the close connection between language and thought. Such a study is that of Jean Piaget, whose data, leading to definite conclusions as to the mental processes of the child, consist of transcriptions of actual conversations of children. At the outset of his discussion he makes the following statement: "This is not the place to raise the vexed question of the relation between thought and language, but we may note in passing that the very existence of such questions shows how complex are the functions of language, and how futile to reduce them all to one. . . . that of communicating thought."[15] In his study entitled "Judgment and Reasoning in the Child" he states: "—If such are the habits of childish thought, childish idiom ought to display a discontinuous and chaotic character in contrast to the deductive style of the adult, logical relations being omitted or taken for granted."[16] Major (1915) in discussing the language of infancy states that the development of the ability to use articulate speech presents problems of peculiar interest since a critical study of the speech-acquiring process in the individual child will throw light upon the most important problems of psychogenesis.[17] In short, the study of infantile language is not to throw light merely on the origin of language (on which subject there are differences of opinion with which we will not deal here) but it is to throw light upon the development of mentality, itself. Writing in 1898 J. Clark Murray says: "The main instrument which man employs for the expression of his conscious states is language, and therefore the Science of Language will be found of continual service to the psychologist; for whether in the wide researches of comparative philology or in the etymology of isolated words, the speech of men often reveals the history of ideas and feelings and mental habitudes, which could not otherwise be traced with so sure a step."[18]

[15] Piaget, Jean: *The Language and Thought of the Child;* Kegan Paul (Harcourt Brace), 1926, p. 2.

[16] Piaget, Jean: *Judgment and Reasoning in the Child;* Kegan Paul (Harcourt Brace), 1928, p. 3.

[17] Major, David R.: *"First Steps in Mental Growth";* Macmillan, 1915, pp. 278-9.

[18] Murray, J. Clark: *A Handbook of Psychology;* DeWolfe Fiske, 1888, pp. 5, 6.

The middle of the nineteenth century brought forth Wundt's statement that the original association between a word and the idea which it expresses becomes modified by substitution and that this is the basis of abstract thinking.[19] [20] Of the same period is Dr. Bain whom Stout quotes as saying that "thinking is restrained speaking or acting."[21]

This statement of Bain's may be regarded as the most mechanistic, if not the most modern, explanation of language. But in 1900 Henry Sweet defines language "as the expression of thought by means of speech sounds."[22] In entire agreement with Bain's radical statement stands Dr. John B. Watson to whom thought is merely implicit muscular behavior, especially the behavior of the speech organs.[23] For Watson, thinking is usually "laryngeating," thought, covert speech. This theory has given rise to much discussion and experimentation. Dashiell says: "The outlook for the investigation of explicit and implicit speaking reactions, so central in the integration and the behavior of the human being, has been stated by Watson. To him, far more than to anyone else, we are indebted for the present-day recognition of the importance of implicit responses. It is highly speculative, but it is possible to 'suppose that future analysis will enable us ultimately to show that every word, syllable, and letter, whether spoken or thought, produces a characteristic form of response which, when recorded, must be looked at from the same standpoint which we adopt when looking at habits elsewhere.' "[24] Pillsbury and Meader in discussing the relations between thought and language say that: "On occasion three different relations may be found: (1) Thought may precede language in definite and detailed imagery, and then be translated into language as a separate process; (2) the only content of thought may be the language; or (3) there may be a mixture of the two." The same writers distinguish between

[19] Wundt, W.: See Robinson and Robinson; *Outline of Psychology;* Kroener, 1907, pp. 339-343.

[20] Robinson and Robinson: *Readings in General Psychology;* University of Chicago Press, 1926, pp. 375-378.

[21] Stout, G. F.: *Manual of Psychology;* Hinds and Noble, 1899, p. 468.

[22] Sweet, Henry; *The History of Language;* Dent (Macmillan), 1900, p. 1.

[23] Watson, John B.: *Psychology From the Standpoint of a Behaviorist;* Lippincott, 1919, pp. 322-324.

[24] Dashiell, John Frederick: *Fundamentals of Objective Psychology;* Houghton Mifflin, 1928, p. 485.

mental content as such, and thought. Of thought, they say that: "one frequently deals with relations, in space, in time, in intensity, of the passive sort and with such more active relations as cause and effect. These are not images but, nevertheless, constitute a large part of the content of thought."[25] In 1892 William James made a rather similar statement when he said that "it makes little or no difference in what sort of mind-stuff, in what quality of imagery, our thinking goes on. The only images intrinsically important are the halting-places, the substantive conclusions, provisional or final, of the thought. Throughout all the rest of the stream, the feelings of relations are everything, and the terms related almost naught."[26]

"Thinking and speaking are at the beginning of the child's use of language almost synonymous," says Fenton in *A Practical Psychology of Babyhood*.[27] But O'Shea states that " 'I know but cannot tell' is often psychologically true. It is not true that what a learner knows he can explain or define."[28] Similarly Preyer, in discussing the activity of his fourteen months old son when he meaningfully pointed at a candle says: "For the understanding of mental development it is an important fact that this pointing is already employed with perfect correctness before the first attempts at expression in words."[29] It is not to be understood that this statement contradicts that of Dr. Watson, who pays particular attention to non-language (i.e.—not speech) forms of thought and leaves room in his theory for the form of implicit activity which is seen to best advantage in non-speaking individuals such as deaf mutes, an appropriate bodily act. Thus a student of Watson conducted an experiment with mutes, attaching a sensitive instrument to the hands of the subjects while the subject was thinking. While the experiment was not satisfactorily completed, the resulting graphic curve, representing the movement of the fingers, looked much like a muscular fatigue curve.

[25] Pillsbury, Walter B. and Meader, Clarence L.: *The Psychology of Language;* Appleton, 1928, p. 99.

[26] James, William: *Psychology;* Henry Holt, 1892, p. 169.

[27] Fenton, Jessie C.: *The Psychology of Babyhood;* Houghton Mifflin, 1925, p. 138.

[28] O'Shea, M. V.: *Linguistic Development and Education;* Macmillan, 1907, p. 146.

[29] Preyer, W.: *The Mind of the Child,* Pt. I (Trans.); Appleton, 1905, p. 321.

Much experimentation has been conducted in recent years by attaching appropriate instruments to the organs of articulation and the larynx while the subject was engaged in thought to ascertain whether or not any movement could be detected. Agnes M. Thorson in *Tongue Movements and Internal Speech* gives a good resumé of past work in this field, a criticism of such work, and the report of a well-conducted experiment. Her conclusions are that "movements of the tongue are not universal in internal speech or verbal thought. When tongue movements do not occur, it is not likely that other overt language mechanisms are functioning in place of the tongue."[30] She criticizes previous investigators, giving the three following objections to their methods of procedure: first, the apparati, on the ground that they responded to other movements of the buccal cavity besides that of the tongue or larynx, as the case might be; second, to the interpretation of results, since such movement might take place irrespective of, or without, thought; and third, the suggestibility of the subject. Such investigators were Curtis, who, experimenting in 1899, found some movement of the larynx in fifteen out of twenty subjects and none in the other five. In 1902, Coster, despite individual differences, noted tongue movements in all subjects when thinking. Wycsorski in 1913, found every thought accompanied by some movement. In the same year Printer, having experimented, concluded that articulation during reading was unnecessary, that reading was as good without it, and that, with practice, it improved without it. In 1916 Reed stated that tongue movement with thought was individual, rather than universal, while Clark, in 1902, experimenting with both tongue and larynx, concluded that the greater part of thinking was done without implicit speech.[31]

At the risk of being facetious, it might be well to cite an argument of the somewhat superficial, but always humorous Harvey Wickham who says ". . . . These subvocal movements seem always to be going on when we are thinking and to some minds it seems logical to say that an accompaniment or a consequence is a cause. . . . I have often noticed that a little troupe of dogs usually accompanies

[30] Thorson, Agnes M.: Tongue Movements and Internal Speech, *Journal of Exper. Psych.*, Vol. VIII, 1925, p. 1 seq.

[31] Thorson, Agnes M.: ibid.; p. 1 seq.

Mrs. Belfeather on her walks in the park. I now learn that these dogs *are* Mrs. Belfeather."[32]

Should sufficiently delicate instruments be devised, and should it be proved that bodily movement always accompanies thought, we still have not proved that bodily movement and thought are one and the same thing.

As we understand it, Watson explains our inability to remember the events of our infancy by ascribing it to our linguistic inability at that time. In short, we do not remember for the simple reason that we do not think. Compayré, writing in 1909, gives rather a twist to the problem when he says that language ". . . . is acquired only by the aid of the nascent memory of the child. The period of the memory does not begin until the child can talk."[33] It is probable that the latter, but earlier, writer is putting his intellectual cart before the horse. The question of memory in relation to language is of course a field of its own and is likely for some time to look like the age-old discussion: "Which came first, the chicken or the egg?" But it may be remarked in passing that even M. Compayré states that "in order to arrive at that point (real memory) an essential condition is required in addition to the natural progress of intelligence, of what English psychologists call 'ideation'; it is the possession of language."[34]

Before leaving the field of experimentation it is interesting to note an experiment in thought transference conducted by Hansen and Lehmann, who found that such "psychical" communication consisted of involuntary whispering.[35]

Another writer who puts thought on the physiological basis, is Baldwin, who, according to Markey, associates the beginnings of conceptual or abstract thought with speech and language, silent thought being internal speech.[36] Markey himself states: "A symbol

[32] Wickham, Harvey: *The Misbehaviorists;* The Dial Press, 1928, p. 62.

[33] Compayré, Gabriel: *The Intellectual and Moral Development of the Child,* Pt. I (Trans.); Appleton, 1909, pp. 227-228.

[34] Ibid.

[35] Lehman and Hansen: *Ueber Unwilkuerliches Fleustern, Philos. Studies;* 1891, XI, p. 41 (See Scripture)

Scripture, E. W.: *The New Psychology;* Scribner, 1897, p. 63.

[36] Markey, John F.: *The Symbolic Process and Its Integration in Children;* Harcourt Brace, 1928, p. 14.

may be defined as an act or object which is marked off by behaviour as a substitute for a stimulus-act or -object, and a response-act or -object, and which is also, at the same time, set off by behaviour as different from them. . . . . While language symbols might be used as practically synonymous with this definition, it would probably be preferable to restrict language to speech and gesture symbols and retain the term symbol to include also other objects, such as emblems, art, etc., which have this particular relation shown in its clearest form in language."[37] Allport claims that, in terms of behaviour, thinking involves two components, of which one is the use of symbols, and states that "A symbol is a brief and labile response usually undetected in outward behaviour but capable of being substituted for overt responses. Incipient, subvocal and inaudible responses are particularly suitable material for symbols."[38] "Thought requires symbols, and words are the most serviceable symbols," says Breese, "It is also true that the development of language and the development of thought take place together and that without the verbal sign of oral and written language our systems of thought could never have reached their present state of perfection. There is no reason to suppose, however, that in the absence of the invention of words thought would have been impossible."[39] It is quite probable that even Dr. Watson would agree with this last statement. In this connection it is interesting to consider what O'Shea has aptly called "sentence words," used by the small child, by which symbol the child expresses a whole sentence or train of thought.[40] Another example is that of the language of gesture, thought by many to have preceded, in the development of man, the language of words and syntax.

Eastman, discussing the enjoyment of poetry, states that "words make the world grow . . . . not because they express a feeling . . . . but because they give to the feeling locality and distinct body."[41] Here we have an art critic understanding, more or less consciously, the dependence of the mental concept on the word.

Urwick, writing in 1907, said, "Words are symbolic percepts, important not for what they are but for what they enable the mind

[37] Woodworth, Robert S.: ibid; pp. 28-29.
[38] Allport, Floyd H.: ibid; p. 55.
[39] Breese, B. B.: *Psychology;* Scribner, 1921, p. 320.
[40] O'Shea, M. V.: ibid; p. 39.
[41] Eastman, Max: *The Enjoyment of Poetry;* Scribner, 1914, pp. 50, 51.

to do—to entertain a meaning of another percept without its presence, to communicate that meaning to others, and understand the meanings of others. But words are not the only symbolic percepts, if they are the most important ones." He also states that, "If the ear be at all defective, learning must necessarily be retarded, and with it, the growth of ideas."[42]

In 1867 the Most Rev. William, Lord Archbishop of York wrote to the effect that language abbreviates the process of thought, and that definitions or explanations of propositions "have the power of new truths even for ourselves."[43]

Perhaps, of all the brief summaries made, Woodworth's is the most satisfactory when he says, "In spite of all that can be said in its favor, the thesis that thought equals inner speech is probably wrong. . . . . At certain times thought runs away from speech. When thought is very active, speech becomes fragmentary." He calls our attention to the facts that we can think one thing while saying another (Thorson made use of this fact, in her experiment), and that in order to think a thought it is not sufficient to say the words in which the thought is expressed. He finally concludes that "speech plays a part in the preliminary stage (of reasoning—the exploratory process). It helps greatly in assembling the data, but grasping the new knowledge present in the combined data is seeing, not talking."[44] Now, what we understand Woodworth to mean by "seeing" is what is sometimes termed insight or configuration (Gestalt).[45] The result of following this train of thought leads inevitably back to the social concept of thought, touched upon at the beginning of this study. Inextricably bound together and interdependent as language and thought may be in this, their social or any other conceivable aspect, to say that they are identical is probably merely an oversimplification, which tends to complicate rather than to clarify the problem. Suffice it to say that thought and language, at times identical, may, for the most part be considered two different but mutually dependent aspects of the social life of man.

[42] Urwick, W. E.: *The Child's Mind—Its Growth and Training;* Arnold, 1907, pp. 100 and 94.

[43] William, The Most Rev., Lord Archbishop of York: *An Outline of The Laws of Thought;* Longmans Green, 1867. (See Robinson).

Robinson and Robinson: ibid; pp. 394, 395.

[44] Woodworth, Robert S.: ibid; pp. 442, 443.

[45] Koffka, K.: *The Growth of the Mind;* Harcourt Brace, 1924, pp. 131, 157, 179.

CHARACTER DEVELOPMENT THROUGH SPEECH TRAINING

LAURA WHITMIRE YOUNG
Seattle, Washington

THERE is nothing startlingly new about the general idea of speech education. Demosthenes, with his mouth full of pebbles, shouted to the resounding waves to correct lisping; our grandmothers puckered their lips into "prunes and prisms" according to the popular speech training of the day; and most of us who "took" elocution in the early years of the twentieth century learned to "express" according to Delsarte, pity, terror, sorrow, and the rest of the seventy deadly emotions.

The revival of public interest in speech, whether or not it is the result of the radio and the talking picture, has made itself felt in the curriculum of the public schools. Speech classes that were once half-hearted combinations of English Composition and old-fashioned piece-saying have become the center of the school's activity in atuning the child to the society of which he is a part. This new aim of speech education has developed as a result of the growing appreciation of the influence of speech on character—a subtle connection made appreciable through a better understanding of educational psychology.

A child who has, or thinks he has, any peculiarity that sets him apart from his fellows, suffers a handicap that is difficult for a person of normal reactions to appreciate. This peculiarity does not have to be so marked as a speech hesitation or a lisp. Indeed, it does not have to be a speech defect at all. It may be a mental slant that needs to be adjusted or a character tendency that needs to be re-set. Herein lies the difference between the old elocution training and the modern speech work: the elocution teacher merely tacked on decorative speech as an outside finish; the speech teacher of today is a specialist in applied psychology or mental hygiene. By reconditioning a child's behavior, the school makes its greatest contribution to society. And the opportunity for this work is most favorable in the speech class.

This re-education cannot be begun too soon. The infant is born with certain physical and mental tendencies. Environment begins with his first cry and, before the school has had its oppor-

tunity to add its environmental influence, character has started to shape into basic form. Fortunately, character is not set until the child has passed adolescence. This character is the intangible substance upon which the speech teacher has to work.

Just what type of character-mold the child has, is not always evident in this new world of school into which he is plunged, for, all too often, the warping influence of early fears, embarrassments and inhibitions have checked his ability to reflect his true character through his responses. The reactions which the teacher and his fellow students see is his personality—his "social stimulus value," as Professor May of Harvard defines personality.

The personality of a child usually is judged, as is that of a mature person, by the appeal made to the eye and the ear. So accustomed is the world to the making of snap-judgments that it often unfairly attributes to the child a character which does not correspond to his real self. Suppose he is shifty in his glance, his clothes do not seem to belong to his body, he starts when spoken to and sometimes is unexpectedly bold and unruly. Instead of the obvious inference, investigation may disclose undernourishment, home bickerings, fear, inferiority among his fellows, and unbearable shyness. Or, a boy is blatant-voiced, is always in a conspicuous place, or pushes his fellow students about. It is difficult to realize that all this may be compensation for a home that is deficient in all of the expected comforts and niceties. A girl lisps, hangs her head, shrinks back, talks with a tiny voice and looks from appealing, apparently helpless eyes. How guess that she has found from home experience that this is the best way to be the center of the group and to receive the attention and admiration she craves? The list goes on indefinitely. Every student is a different case and each case presents a new psychological problem.

All of the child's peculiarities have developed through his early experiences. He has been conditioned to react in a certain way. Instinctively the baby has only two fears, the fear of loud noises and the fear of lack of support, or falling. These may be transferred to every known fear—just as the fear occasioned by the dog's loud bark may be transferred in a child's mind to a fear of fur. An adolescent boy is afraid to speak before an audience because previous audience speaking has produced an unpleasant reaction and so he is unfavorably conditioned—apparently forever. Perhaps he was ridi-

culed or criticized in such a way that he associated only misery with the attempt. A girl is on the debate team but when she talks to a small group, she either "orates" to them or hesitates and cannot find words. She always has received praise for her public work, but when the platform no longer gives her the expected condition for speech, she recalls social blunders and former moments of misery.

It is the speech teacher's hope to present every negative response with so many favorable experiences that in time all responses are positive. Needless to say, the criticism involved will be a nice balance between compliment and subtle suggestion. The child must always feel that he is meeting the approval of both the class and the teacher—but that there is always possibility for some improvement. Besides, he must grow to look forward eagerly to the constructive criticism as a means to make his next work even more satisfactory. Only occasionally will attention be focused on the comparative results of two students—unless back of such procedure there is a plan. Sometimes, superior-student, Mary, may be compared unfavorably with inferior-student, John, to their mutual benefit—providing the comparison is just. Tactful criticism that never hurts, and compliments that always "leave a good taste in the mouth" are the rule. It does not take a class long to follow the example, and a general attitude of kindliness is the prevailing mood of the recitation room. Nothing helps more to eliminate fear and start the re-conditioning. This spirit of ease carries over not only into the entire school, but has a lasting influence on the character of the young people who experience it.

Perhaps it seems exaggerated to say that to put power into a timid voice eventually puts courage into the character, but such is the case. If all teachers did not have faith in an old theory that assumes that a change of exterior in time produces an inward change, teaching would indeed be a disheartening profession. The actual physical process of "stiffening the upper lip," so some psychologists tell us, tends to stimulate courage of the heart. In order to illustrate this idea, William James gives the example of the boy who whistles when he passes the cemetery. The stiffened lips of the whistler are the stiff lips of courage and the result is at least temporary bravery. So a student who takes the correct posture, a slow breath and a clear, smooth tone for speech convinces not only his audience

but ultimately himself that he has courage enough for platform recitation.

Most of the corrections in a group of 150 students are minor ones, but there are always enough special problems in every class to present the teacher with a real laboratory. A few cases needing medical attention will be found in every class. These cases should be sent to the school nurse for examination. The child with voice suggesting goiter; the one with insufficient nasal resonance suggesting adenoids; the one with chronic hoarseness suggesting serious throat infection; or the one with vocal inaccuracies suggesting eye or ear weakness. Palate deficiencies that have not been mended or taken care of by an artificial palate are very rare in these days of orthodentistry, as are very bad cases of malocclusion. However, any one of these physical difficulties, even after its correction, is likely to be accompanied by a need for re-habituation of method of voice production as well as a need for psychological re-conditioning to the speech situation—palate trouble in particular often retaining its original speech manifestation with accompanying nervousness personality slants.

Adolescent fear runs the gamut from merely awareness of large ears and red hands up to a dread of receiving a poor grade—the school-room badge of disapproval. Every fear expresses itself in a vocal peculiarity. Under the guise of correcting the vocal difficulties, the speech teacher can create situations for the discussion and admission (hence release) of fears and inhibitions, and invent schemes for practice which develop pride in expression. Every recitation opens opportunities for reconditioning the student through speech habits. If the teacher never expects of the student more than he is able to accomplish at the time, discouragement will never block the path of progress mapped out ahead of time.

The most severe case of stuttering, strange as it may seem, has as its strongest immediate cause, the fear of stuttering. Once the student understands this, is assured that the class room attitude is encouraging, and realizes that there is a definite technique of speech production which he can master at will, his correction is only a matter of being given the opportunity to experience success often enough to create security. The final correction of the stutterer is most difficult, because, when a new situation presents itself, the old

fear returns and with it the hesitation. He must be assisted to carry over the feeling of security to every situation he can imagine.

Meanwhile, he must be taught to face life squarely, not to depend on others (often his mother or the teacher) to see him through or shelter him from his difficulties. A positive attitude must be established and, above all, pride in and a real desire for good speech. In order to accomplish this seeming miracle, some attempt must be made to go into the case history and discover the possible contributing causes, cooperation with the family must be assured, and then a planned program of satisfactory experiences must be arranged and uninterruptedly followed.

Junior, a superior type of fifteen year old boy, had been working for ten months with a special teacher, paying for his lessons from his own earnings—indication enough of the desire for correction. He had passed successfully all of the expected stumbling blocks; had eliminated over-stimulating experiences such as too many moving pictures, detective stories, jazz music, late hours; never allowed fear to make him refuse to recite when called upon in school; remembered his technique of relaxation, deep, even breathing and full vocalization on all occasions. He had even reached the point where he had developed a resonant, clear-cut, steady voice and had signed up to take part in the school oratorical contest. Suddenly, he came to his teacher as nearly in tears as is admissible for a fifteen-year old boy. He had "made a fool of himself" in class by stuttering over reading aloud. A detailed confession brought out the reason: he had been tiring himself by too much athletic work combined with late hours, he had failed to recite when he could and should have done so, and after having promised himself not to go to a moving picture that particular week, he had gone. This moral defeat had preyed upon his mind to such an extent that he had confessed to his mother—and she had cried! Is it any wonder that old conflicts were stirred to life? He was reassured and sent away with sufficient "penance" duties to relieve him and to build for ultimate security.

Jimmie and his mother were sent by a psychiatrist. Jimmie was five and a stutterer. He adored his pretty mother—but she was becoming deaf, and, in spite of his efforts, he could not make her hear him. Because she was afraid of entirely losing her hearing, she was nervous and irritable, and scolded Jimmie when he hesitated or repeated. Every speech experience for Jimmie was filled with

anxiety to make his mother hear and fear that he would not succeed and would be scolded. A combined lesson in lip-reading for the mother and slow careful utterance with correct breathing for Jimmie sent the two away after several months with the problem at least on the road toward being solved.

Often stuttering and some form of lisping or slovenly utterance are present at the same time. The fear connection is obvious. Unable to make himself understood, the student expects unfavorable reaction to the speech experience and fear is established. Fear checks the natural breath, spasmodically closes the throat and then the victim starts to stutter, fear continues, and the vicious hoop rolls on.

Even voice inadequacies may be the result of fears. Bill was sixteen and a well-developed, prospective football player. He was sent to the speech teacher because he spoke in a cracked falsetto voice. He entered the class late and consequently was allowed to sit and "listen in" for two weeks. At first, he was obviously amused by the relaxing and breathing exercises and the various recitations. One day, when voluntary recitations were called for, he rose sheepishly from his seat. He was acknowledged. Following the prescribed custom, he walked deliberately to the front, relaxed, took a deep breath, and started slowly, "I am going to recite on"—the voice that came out was a resonant, bass rumble that electrified the class, startled the teacher, and almost paralyzed the boy. A delicate moment to handle in the day's routine! "Where in the world did you get that splendid voice?" relieved the strain and everyone laughed good-humoredly and in celebration of his victory. "I just followed the directions," came in the thin, little voice that everyone recognized as Bill's. "Well, try for it again." Again the preparation. Again the resulting Boom! The cure had begun. Gradually, he ceased using the falsetto voice. Fear of the unusual had tensed his throat. Having matured at an early age, he had struggled against allowing his voice to "change."

Ellen, a large, athletic type of girl, spoke in a light, breathy voice. Investigation revealed that she fully vocalized on the playfield and in her basketball games. Throughout her childhood she had been continually "shushed" by over-zealous parents who wanted to make a soft-spoken lady of their little tomboy, and, as a result of the constant corrections, she had resorted to whispering. A few of the usual exercises relieved the difficulty.

However, many of the voice inadequacies, as well as lisping are not so much a result of fear as of home association, carelessness, and habit. Such habits include letter substitutions, omissions, poor enunciation, peculiarities of inflection, and foreign accent. Often a student is not even aware that the habit exists until his attention is drawn to the fact during the analysis. Correction begins at once. The most important part of the whole treatment is the correct diagnosis of the case.

Indeed, the modern speech teacher is something of a vocal physician and mental healer. She is never in a hurry for miraculous cures, is never excited over a temporary relapse, and is thoroughly understanding and professionally (but never emotionally) sympathetic. She diagnoses her cases, prescribes the sugar-coated pills and designates the correct physical exercises, mental diet and moral rules of life. Then she waits and hopes for the best. If she is both skilled and lucky, she will receive her reward as she watches her group of patients pass through the various stages of progress from illness and convalescence to the normal health of body, mind, and speech with which all were originally intended to be blessed.

THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON CHILD HEALTH AND PROTECTION

SUB-COMMITTEE ON THE CHILD DEFECTIVE IN SPEECH

(Excerpts from the official report, the complete text of which may be obtained from the office of the Conference, Interior Building, Washington, D. C.).

THE White House Conference on Child Health and Protection was called by President Hoover to meet in November of 1930, and was the culmination of many months of study, on the part of 170 technical committees, of present conditions of health, education, recreation, employment, and home life of American children. As a part of the work of the committee on Special Classes, a Sub-Committee on the Child Defective in Speech, consisting of Robert West, Ph.D., Chairman, Professor of Speech Pathology, University of Wisconsin, Madison; Lee E. Travis, Ph.D., Director of Speech Clinic, University of Iowa, Iowa City; and Pauline B. Camp, Director of Child Guidance and Special Education, Madison (Wis-

consin) Public Schools, submitted a report based upon a very extensive survey of what is being done in American schools, for children defective in speech and voice.

Findings

1. There are in America 1,000,000 school children between the ages of 5 and 18 so defective in speech as to require remedial treatment and training. This number is exclusive of those defective as to speech who stopped their schooling before reaching 18 years.
2. The various types of speech defects show the following distribution in 10,000 defectives:

Sound substitution	4,623.80
Stuttering	2,214.96
Oral inactivity	1,146.44
Articulatory defects (structural)	860.02
Dialectal defects	575.64
Voice defects (Functional)	230.67
Voice defects (Structural)	181.38
"Hard-of-Hearing" defects	80.69
Articulatory defects (paralytic)	49.28
Aphasias	.33
Voice defects (paralytic)	.17

3. The work of speech correction is entirely limited to the city public school systems; the rural communities and smaller towns are without facilities for the correction of the child defective in speech.
4. The work of speech correction is prosecuted more efficiently and economically in the primary years of the child's schooling than later.
5. The average cost per pupil of a program of speech correction as now organized is about $10.00 per annum.

Recommendations Adopted by the Conference

1. That the work of speech correction be extended so that every "unit" of the school system of the country shall have a speech correction department of its own or shall have the services of such a department. By "unit" we mean every school system having its own autonomous superintendency. In cities the work should be organized under the superin-

tendent's office, and in rural districts and in villages it should be presented under the direction of the office of the County (or Parish) Superintendent of Schools.

2. That the work be prosecuted in connection with the regular program of school work, the children defective in speech to be educated with the normal except for the periods when they shall be given their speech training. These periods should be not more than 30 minutes in length and as frequent as the "case load" will permit. As far as possible these children should be given their speech training in a room in the same building in which they do the rest of their work.
3. That the program of speech correction should be regarded partly, if not largely, as speech hygiene; and as such, emphasis should be placed upon the arrest of incipient disorders of speech when they first appear. The ideal program of speech correction should embrace the entire school system; inasmuch, however, as the most effective results are achieved with the young children, the superintendent having limited funds for this work should concentrate his forces upon speech hygiene of children in the lower grades.
4. That most cases of speech defect must be handled individually, but that in rare instances children with similar defects should be handled in groups. It should be pointed out, however, that speech disorders are almost never "typical" and that because of the individualistic nature of each case, it seldom happens that in a relatively small building more than two or three children will be found having defects sufficiently similar to profit by group training.
5. That for the sake of economy of administration, the defective children must be classified into four groups, the probable size of which is indicated by the percentage following each:
   (a) Those whose defects are remediable, but whose intelligence is so low as to render the advantage of exact speech not worth the effort to secure it. (3%)
   (2) Those whose defects are irremediable; such as defects caused by inoperable structural anomalies. (2%)

(c) Those whose defects are remediable but not by the standard methods employed with other defectives having similar symptoms; such as a case presenting complications of two or more independent causes. (10%)

(d) Those whose defects will yield to standard methods; presenting no complications or deviation as to aetiology. (85%)

Group (a) should be trained to a degree of speech proficiency commensurate with their intellectual capacities and needs.

Group (b) should be left out of the speech training program. To attempt the training of such children serves only to make them unnecessarily self-conscious and anxious about their speech.

Group (c) should be referred to workers whose training and experience especially equip them to handle such cases. These cases are properly clinic rather than class-room problems.

Group (d) should be trained by the general staff of the speech correction department. In order that this training of group (d) children should proceed advantageously and efficiently it is necessary that the teacher employ from the beginning methods appropriate to the case. Proper diagnosis of the cause of each case of speech disorder becomes, therefore, one of the major factors in economy of administration.

6. That in most schools in which the work has been established the "case load" of the teacher of speech correction should be greatly reduced. Inefficient work serves only to discourage pupils and parents about remediability of speech. The efficiency of the work decreases rapidly beyond a load of 100 cases per teacher, and increases as the load is reduced below 100 cases. A load of 50 cases should be considered optimum.

7. That, in order to carry out the diversified program as outlined above, there should be established in each city (or county, for the rural schools) a speech clinic to which problems difficult to classify, diagnose, or treat should be referred. Usually the director of the department of speech correction will be the clinical officer.

8. That the training of the worker in speech correction should be more than that required of general teachers of the same

rank, and that the additional work should include a well-balanced offering selected from the following subjects: Phonetics, Physiology, Anatomy, Neurology, Psychology, Education, Psychometrics, Bio-Chemistry, Genetics, Sociology, Physical Education, and Speech (including both the artistic speech and Speech Pathology).

In order to provide for the extended program suggested above—a program many times larger than the present one—it seems logical that there must be organized teacher-training courses in speech correction in institutions in connection with which large groups of young children are used as material for demonstration and practice teaching. It will probably come about, therefore, that the staff members of the speech correction departments of our public schools will receive their training in teachers' colleges or in schools of education in universities, and that the trainers of these teachers will have received their technical education in the graduate schools of universities offering very advanced work in Speech Pathology. The directors and clinical officers of each large school system should have received their training at one of these graduate centers.

9. That, in order to support a sound program of speech hygiene, teacher-training institutions should include elementary courses in speech disorders as a part of the training of primary teachers; and that superintendents should, everything else being equal, give preference to candidates for positions in the lower grades who have had such training.
10. That there should be established in America one or more institutes for research as to the cause and prevention of and the proper training and treatment for the various disorders of speech, and that the findings of such institutes should be made available to the worker in the field of speech correction.

Recommendations Concerning the General Field of Special Education

1. The immediate organization of a national council for handicapped children, made up of representatives of the national organizations interested in such children, to promote aggres-

sively measures for making effective the recommendations of the Committee on Special Classes of the White House Conference on Child Health and Protection.

2. The immediate creation in each State of a State advisory council for handicapped children, made up of representatives of State organizations or agencies, interested in such children, to co-operate with the national council and to work aggressively for making effective the recommendations of the Committee on Special Classes of the White House Conference on Child Health and Protection.

EDITORIALS

ON TO DETROIT

On December 28, 29, and 30, 1931, at Hotel Statler in Detroit, will be held the Sixteenth Annual Convention of the National Association of Teachers of Speech. It is going to be a great convention. President Simon is arranging for an interesting program, the feature of which is to be a reduction in the number and length of formal meetings and a corresponding increase in time for informal conference and fellowship.

In the past two or three years our National Association has been suffering somewhat from growing pains. This year the officers hope that we shall meet with a fine unanimity of spirit and a deep devotion to our common interests. This hope is stimulated by the fact that, notwithstanding the remarkable professional progress which we have made in the past decade and a half, we are now facing special difficulties and perplexities which will require the most sober and thoughtful consideration of the best minds in our organization, if we are to continue our forward march. Some of the blight of the great economic depression has fallen upon our enterprise. There is a tremendous demand in the educational world for economy of operation. In many places conditions do not favor the development of separate departments of speech. It is a time which requires a searching reappraisal of objectives and techniques in our field. It is probable that within the next five years, we shall be called upon as we have not been recently, to justify our place in the educational scheme of things. Although we may be driven back on some sectors, we must do what we can to hold the lines and push ahead wherever possible. It is certain that it will do us all good to get out of the trenches at Christmas time and assemble in Detroit for three days of mutual understanding and inspiration.

STYLES IN SPEAKING

Not long ago the committee in charge of a national contest in speaking prepared for the judges an elaborate set of instructions in which the statement was made that the judges were not to vote for or against any contestant because of any preconceived notion as to "which style of speaking is the correct one." Several of the judges vigorously objected to these instructions, and one announced a firm adherence to the proposition that there is only one correct style of speaking which should be approved generally and endorsed wherever judgment is passed upon contestants, viz., *the conversational style.*

For the past two decades at least, *the conversational style* has been the shibboleth of the profession. The cult of *the conversational* has become a veritable religion. Here and there teachers and students of public speaking are beginning to question seriously the specificity of this term. Has any one ever seen a definition which clearly and unambiguously indicates just what is meant by *the conversational?* It is a curious fact that wherever and whenever competent critics hear really good public speaking, they are likely to insist that it should be classified as *conversational.* Thus the term becomes delightfully vague and increasingly useless for teacher and student. Conversation is as varied as human life and personality. Doubtless much good has come out of our insistence upon directness and simplicity in public address, but it is quite possible that there have arisen some concomitant weaknesses in the direction of commonplaceness and lacklustre performance. We need to remember that there is considerable difference between the directness and simplicity of the untrained novitiate and the directness and simplicity of the trained artist. The old concept of *the conversational* seems about due to become the object of careful and painstaking re-study.

THE STORY OF A CONTEST

Récently in the Mid-west, under the auspices of a newspaper league, there was held a state oratorical contest. Eight speakers, representing different sections of the state, participated. The newspapers underwrote the expenses of the contest, which were considerable, and one of the prominent publishers acted as chairman (and

an enforcer extraordinary of the rules, as shall hereinafter appear). The judges were the Chief Justice of the State Supreme Court, the Chairman of the Department of Speech at the State University, and a publicist and politician well-known as a practitioner of the art of public address.

The instructions for judging contained the following statements: "The low point total system, modified by the majority system is to be used. . . . If a contestant secures the low point total victory and also has first place from a majority of the judges, he or she is to be declared the winner. If no speaker secures the lowest total and the majority of first places, then the judges, without consultation, are to re-ballot on the three having the lowest totals. In case four or more are tied for low total or two for first, or two or more for second, then the four or more names, as the case may be, are to be re-submitted to the judges. This procedure is to be followed until one speaker secures the lowest total and a majority of firsts. Judges are to consider these points in making their selection:

> "(1) The fitness of the contestant to make a worthy showing in the highest stages of the contest—character, poise, and personality to be the criterions. (*sic*).
>
> "(2) The composition of the prepared address, with particular emphasis on historical accuracy, logic, and general literary effectiveness.
>
> "(3) Moving power—the extent to which the speakers can thrill, quicken, and compel."

A reading of these instructions left the judges in considerable doubt as to just what they were expected to do, and, unfortunately those responsible for running the contest did not themselves seem to be very clear as to the interpretation of the rules. It seemed quite possible to all who read the instructions that the statement, "This procedure is to be followed until one speaker secures the lowest total and the majority of firsts," might lead to dead-locking the jury indefinitely. One of the judges made bold to inquire as to just how he was expected to estimate the "character" of each of the various contestants. However, the unhappy events which transpired were not in the nature of difficulties with the judging system.

Before introducing the first speaker, the presiding officer announced that the time limit on the orations was six minutes, that

the contestants would be given "a leeway of ten seconds," and that anyone who overran the time limit would be automatically disqualified and placed at the foot of the list.

The second speaker, a high school freshman, aged fifteen, had chosen to discuss "THE CITIZEN, HIS PRIVILEGES AND DUTIES AS GUARANTEED BY THE CONSTITUTION." Apparently overcome by the weight of his subject, he collapsed on the platform after he had spoken for three or four minutes, was carried from the room, and the Chairman announced that he had been automatically disqualified. Then the contestant who would have received a unanimous first place was told, after he had finished speaking, that he had run twelve seconds over the six minutes, and the judges were ordered to disregard him in their balloting. This announcement came as a complete surprise to everybody concerned, since the time-keeper had given the speaker no warning. Two of the other contestants stopped instantly at the time-keeper's warning given six minutes and ten seconds after they had begun to speak. The chair announced in each case that the speaker had been automatically disqualified since he had spoken ten seconds over the allotted six minutes! Contestants, coaches, and audience began to wonder what the chair had meant by "ten seconds leeway."

The judges' task was considerably simplified since four of the contestants, including two who were easily the outstanding contenders for first honors, had been removed from the picture by the rulings of the chairman. However, even then there was a tie for second place and a second ballot of the judges was necessary. Finally, three handsome trophy cups and the right to represent the state in the interstate contest were awarded to three of the four survivors.

Be it said that all eight of the speakers were presenting excellent speeches with better than average speaking ability. A person would have had to be hyperitical to find anything unworthy or improper in the performance of the contestants themselves and yet, through incompetent management, the whole affair in which much time, effort, and money had been invested was reduced to a fiasco. One of the very intelligent coaches whose entrant had been disqualified, announced at the conclusion of the contest, "I'm all washed up on this sort of thing." One recalls the colored man who, in reply to the judge's question, "Have you anything to say why sentence of death

should not be passed upon you?", observed, "Nuthin', Jedge, 'cept that it will be a powerful lesson to me." This contest was a powerful lesson to a number of people. It is such experiences that led our committee to report at Chicago last year that "the conduct and management of Speech contests should be vested in members of the educational profession." Of course, universal adherence to the principle back of the committee's recommendation would not bring perfect management, but at least such tragedies as that recounted here would be avoided.

THE FORUM

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL REVISION

In the secretary's minutes of the 1930 Convention the following item appears: "After a thorough discussion and conference with interested members, the council decided to recommend that the President appoint a committee on constitutional revision to study, not only the amendment offered on the floor of the convention, but any other changes which might seem desirable in the light of the recent growth in the size of our Association and in the scope of its activities. President Dolman made the following announcement of the appointment of this committee:

> " '(a) The President has appointed a committee consisting of Ralph Dennis, Chairman; Sara Barber; L. E. Bassett; A. H. Monroe; and F. M. Rarig, to study the Constitution and to propose such revisions as they think proper at the next annual convention.
>
> " '(b) The Council recommends that this committee consider particularly the following points:
>
> " '1. The limitation of membership and tenure of office on the Council.
>
> " '2. The method of amending the constitution.
>
> " '3. The possibility of voting by mail.' "

The committee thus constituted and instructed submits the following proposed constitution and by-laws for publication:

CONSTITUTION

Article I

NAME

The name of this association shall be THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH.

Article II

Officers

The officers of this association shall be:

President
First Vice-President
Second Vice-President
Executive Secretary
Editor of the Quarterly Journal of Speech
Editor of Research Studies
Members of the Executive Council

Article III

Sec. 1 The Executive Council shall consist of: the President, the Executive Secretary, the Editor of the Journal, and the Editor of Research Studies for the term of their respective offices and for three years thereafter, at the end of which period they shall remain permanently as non-voting, advisory members; three members, elected at large, one each year, for a term of three years; the Vice-Presidents; the President, or his representative, of the Western Association, of the Southern Association, of the Eastern Public Speaking Conference, of the American Society for the Study of Disorders of Speech, and of such other regional or special associations or federations as may hereafter be officially recognized by the Executive Council.

Sec. 2 Regular meetings of the Executive Council shall be held each year on the evening preceding, and at noon of the last day of, the national convention. Other meetings may be called by the President.

Sec. 3 The Executive Council shall be the ultimate authority in all matters relating to the Association in the periods between conventions, and it shall direct the policies and administer the affairs of the Association, except as otherwise provided in the constitution and by-laws; its decisions, however, shall be subject to mandate or revision by a majority vote of any two consecutive annual meetings of the Association.

Sec. 4 The President of the Association shall be president of the Executive Council.

Article IV

Duties of Officers

Sec. 1 The President shall prepare the program for the national convention, preside at all business meetings of the Association and of the Executive Council, and represent the Association before other academic organizations. He shall consult with the Executive Secretary in the formulation of any plans involving the expenditure of any considerable sum of money.

Sec. 2 The First Vice-President shall assist the President and perform the duties of the President on occasions of the latter's disability or absence.

SEC. 3 The other Vice-President shall perform whatever specific duties may be assigned to him by the Executive Council or President.

SEC. 4 The Executive Secretary shall perform all the ordinary duties of Secretary and Treasurer of the Association. He shall also serve as Business Manager of the Journal. He shall be responsible to the Executive Council and shall furnish them with a complete annual financial report. If the Executive Secretary wishes additional authority when the Executive Council is not in session he may proceed with the permission of the President and Editor.

Article V

MEMBERSHIP

SEC. 1 Membership in this Association shall be open to any teacher of Speech upon application.

SEC. 2 The Executive Secretary shall grant membership to any other applicants upon written recommendation by any other two members of the Executive Council.

Article VI

AMENDMENTS

SEC. 1 Upon recommendation of the Executive Council, or of any ten members of the Association, this constitution may be amended at any annual meeting by a two-thirds vote of a quorum; provided, however, that before a vote may be taken upon a proposed amendment, said amendment shall have been published in at least one number of the Quarterly Journal. To secure publication the proposers of the amendment shall send typewritten copies, properly signed, to the President and to the Editor at least six weeks previous to the first day of the month of desired publication.

ABSENTEE VOTING

SEC. 2 For the purpose of absentee voting upon any proposed amendment to the Constitution, or upon any question which the Executive Council, or any ten members of the Association, wish to present to the membership of the Association for a vote, a ballot containing the amendment or the question at issue shall be enclosed in, or printed in, an issue of the journal previous to the national convention. To be counted as valid, the ballots must be marked, signed, and returned by mail to the Executive Secretary on or before a day and hour specified by the Executive Council and printed on the ballot.

BY-LAWS

Article I

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

SEC. 1 The President, Vice-Presidents, and one of the three members of the Executive Council to be chosen at large, shall be elected by the Association at each convention. Nomination for this election shall be made by a committee of seven chosen in the following manner: one member shall be named by each of the regional associations officially represented on the

Council. Sufficient additional members to make a total of seven shall be chosen in the following manner; the President shall state that *X* members are to be elected, and without nomination from the floor. Tellers shall distribute blank ballots on which each voter shall place the names of *X* members who are eligible to serve on the committee. No ballot containing more or fewer than the announced number of names shall be counted. The *XX* members receiving the highest number of votes shall be declared elected, the one with the largest plurality being chairman. Any ties in the voting shall be broken by the President. No one shall serve on this committee more than once in three years. The nominating committee shall propose one or more names for each office. Before proceeding to a ballot the President shall always call for additional nominations from the floor.

SEC. 2 The Editor of the Journal shall be elected in the manner provided above except that he shall hold office for three years.

SEC. 3 The Executive Secretary shall be elected by the Executive Council for a term of three years.

SEC. 4 The President and Editor shall be ineligible to succeed themselves.

SEC. 5 When an Editor of the Quarterly Journal of Speech takes office all other positions on the editorial staff should automatically be vacated, leaving the incoming Editor free to organize his staff. The Editor shall consult with the Executive Secretary on all matters involving considerable expenditures.

Article II

DUES

The dues for regular membership in the Association shall be $2.50 a year, payable in advance. This sum covers membership in the Association and subscription to the Journal. The dues for a sustaining membership shall be $10.00 a year, payable in advance. The sustaining membership includes membership in the Association, subscription to the Journal, and, in addition, all other Association publications issued within the period covered by the membership. A fee of $1.00 shall be paid by each person in attendance at the national convention.

Article III

MEETINGS

National conventions shall be held each year at a time and place to be designated by the Executive Council.

Article IV

COMMITTEES

SEC. 1 The Executive Council shall elect a Research Committee the chairman of which shall hold office for three years and act as Editor of Research Studies.

SEC. 2 Other committees may be appointed by the Executive Council, the President, or the Executive Secretary.

Article V

QUORUM

SEC. 1 A quorum at any meeting of the Executive Council shall be eight members.

SEC. 2 A quorum of the Association shall be one-fourth of the members registered at the national convention.

Article VI

AMENDMENTS

These by-laws may be amended by a two-thirds vote at any meeting of the National Association.

Respectfully submitted:

SARA M. BARBER
LEE EMERSON BASSETT
ALAN H. MONROE
FRANK M. RARIG
RALPH DENNIS, *Chairman*

"THEM RADICALS"

Editor of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH:

Now that Professor Williamson has so ably warned the Association of the dangers of democracy, the horrors of a youth movement, and the impending political execution of our learned aristocracy, it remains only to shout the slogan of "a full dinner pail" and the red menace of revolution will be put to rout. The Association will be saved!

The only questions the writer wishes to ask are whether the Association is in such grave danger and whether, if this be so, an unyielding policy is the best one to follow. It seems to the writer that both these questions can be answered in the negative.

First, is there a definite movement on foot to "kill off" the leading members of the profession? An investigation of the proposed revision of the constitution should answer this question. The opinion seems to have gone abroad that the events of the 1930 convention were born of the political ambitions of the less prominent members or from animosity against certain members of the Executive Council. With the exception of one or two over-excited persons, this was not true. The opposition arose from considerations of policy, not personality. It developed from the feeling that the

Association was failing to fulfill certain of its functions, and that the organization of the Association made it impossible to secure action in these matters. No one felt that the Council was not doing well what it did. Many persons felt that some things which had not been done, and toward which there was some opposition on the Council, ought to be done. What some of these things were, will be outlined shortly.

Second, is the Association in danger of dissolving in a political squabble? The word "politics" has many connotations. It is almost as good a label to put upon something to which one is opposed as is the word "radical." If the danger to the Association lies in the attempt by some of its members to secure the adoption of certain policies and a personnel favorably inclined toward carrying them out, policies in which they sincerely believe, then let there be danger. Certain it is that in an Association the size of this one, such endeavor will always be made as long as there is life in it. If this be "politics," then we have always had it and always will have it, whether it be carried on by the few or the many. The writer would personally rather be "buttonholed," as Professor Williamson puts it, than be kept in the dark until the time came to vote "Aye."

Last, who were these "radicals"? The impression seems to be that a few of the impetuous youngsters in the association rose up in wrath and shook the sides of their cribs. As one of the grey haired members of the "younger group" remarked, "Would that I *were* that young again!" Might it not be well to remember that among those who took part in the "events" of the 1930 convention and favored the policies there projected were the chairmen of Speech Departments in four of our larger middle western universities, to say nothing of those in other parts of the country, and that the "radical" group contained within it several of Professor Williamson's "strong men" who have been members of the Association ever since its organization.

Does it not seem that the tremendous danger to the organization arising from politics, and from the unscrupulous or light-headed antics of ambitious youngsters is somewhat of a myth? May it not be that there are enough level-headed members and enough difference of honest opinion in the Association to justify the careful consideration of a change in organization or policy without the charge of radicalism or the implication of personal animosity or jealousy?

What then were the policies which underlay the activities of the 1930 convention? First, certain changes in the Constitution were proposed. Many of these will be found in the proposed revision reported in this issue of the QUARTERLY JOURNAL by the committee appointed last January by the Executive Council. It will be observed that no great overthrowal of the "aristocracy" is contemplated. Provision is made, however, for the more representative expression of the entire membership of the Association. In drawing up these revisions, the committee had before it the Constitutions of the MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION, the ENGLISH COUNCIL, and the AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS. It may be noted that *even with the adoption of the proposed revisions* the constitution of this Association will still be more aristocratic, in the sense Professor Williamson uses the term, than any one of the three above mentioned.

But a still more important difference in policy remains. This involves the question of what is the function of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION. On the one hand there are those who feel that the sole function of the ASSOCIATION is to uphold the academic standing of the profession. The theory is the same as that of the beaten path through the woods to him who makes the best mouse trap. On the other hand there are those who feel that the principal function of the ASSOCIATION lies in promotional activities—the encouragement of state and regional associations, the promotion of speech training in the secondary schools, the organized endeavor to set before administrators and the public the value of speech education through the medium of articles printed in the scholarly magazines of other professional groups, by means of the radio, and through the personal appearance of members of our profession at the meetings of other professional groups. The difficulty lies in the fact that many persons consider these policies as mutually exclusive. It seems to be an *either-or* proposition. I do not believe that this is so. As a matter of fact, the ASSOCIATION has been attempting to fulfill both of these functions for several years. It is true, however, that the major part of its activity has been directed toward the former and that the latter has been somewhat minimized. In some cases, even the attempts of committees in this latter direction have been frowned upon by the Executive Council. Whether or not the action of the Council was justified in these specific cases, I do not know, but the fact is that

activity in this direction has lagged. It may be that the difficulty lies in the lack of time, energy, or money, or it may be that the country is too large for promotional work of a dignified nature by the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION. If this be the case, is it not possible for the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION to bend its energies toward the raising of academic and professional standards, and at the same time to delegate to the state or regional associations the duty of carrying on promotional work? If this were done, the energies of each could be more effectively used. Even with this plan, however, it would be necessary for the national organization to watch over such projects, and to give them the support of its sanction and prestige.

Whether promotional work is to be done by the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION or by regions, it should be done. The beaten pathway through the woods will never be made unless signs point the way to it. Especially is this true in the secondary schools. Cannot those who fear for the academic standing of the profession realize that the advocates of promotional endeavor by the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION are not proposing an alternative but an additional activity for the organization?

At the 1931 convention, the issue will be drawn. The problems which will confront the ASSOCIATION there will be important. If the members will disabuse themselves of the fear that some nefarious plot is being laid by red-eyed radicals, the problems can be discussed frankly and an intelligent decision reached. To quote Sir Roger, "There's much to be said on both sides."

ALAN H. MONROE, *Purdue University*

SOME EXCERPTS FROM A SPEECH*

Editor of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH:

Herewith is a copy of a short speech I made at the Western Convention. It is not an essay; it is just a "talk." I would rework it and make it properly academic, but upon second thought, I have decided that, if it is to be printed, it should be printed as talk.

*The following excerpts represent some of the high lights of the speech which, due to lack of available space, cannot be included entire.

My thesis shall be that speech, *at its best,* is the most highly integrated of human functions, and, therefore, the art, the science, and the pedagogy of speech are inextricably interdependent. . . .

Good educational development is nothing more than training in control. The first functions of the infant are vegetative, and at birth its life is on a vegetative plane. Next, its development is locomotor. Arms and legs and large voluntary muscle systems begin their functioning. With the ability to get about, explorative development is added to the other processes. Fourthly, develops its communicative ability. Note that each stage in its development represents a higher degree of integration. Speculative development represents a fifth stage. The development of rational processes has long been considered the last step in this climax of integration. Let good thought be adequately communicated—in other words, let it become good speech, and still greater integration has been attained. . . .

Integration in a democracy can take place no faster than the growth and extension of its systems of communication and education. Speech, in one way or another, is at the bottom of all these. By far the greater number of students registered for work in departments of speech, are in Speech I, or Fundamentals of Speech courses. There lies our gravest responsibility. Interpretative platform reading and dramatics are of secondary, or even tertiary, importance. . . . .

If, we who conduct Speech courses, are not teaching "correct principles" in the use of the speech organism—which is the whole body—we are derelict members of democracy and pilferers of the educational treasury.

The determining of correct principles is the immediate business of science, and there cannot be intelligently directed improvement in the art of speech—that is, improvement with economy of time—except as science discovers and formulates correct principles.

Note that I said "the determining of correct principles is the immediate business of *science*"—I did not say science of speech. If there be a comprehensive science of speech, it has not been developed. There are *sciences* of various phases of speech. . . .

Our postulate that speech, at its best, is the most highly integrated of human functions precludes the possibility of a *science of speech* at the present stage of human advancement.

Good speech, as has been said, is so much a part of good thinking, and the field of psychology is in too nebulous a state to permit of a science of speech. . . .

And yet, what is called psychology, is for us the most important of the sciences. . . .

Having learned our correct principles from scientific research, it is the business of pedagogy to apply these principles in supervised practice. . . .

It's a poor art whose revelation is meagre. It is poor speech, whose message is trivial or degrading. This inevitably brings us to that perennial bone of contention among teachers of speech—delivery versus content. It strikes me as being a very silly bone. Teaching what we call delivery (probably an unfortunate term)—the management of body for visual symbols and voice and articulatory mechanism for auditory symbols—is very definitely the business of pedagogy. This thing, delivery, we have said is the management of visual and auditory symbols—symbols of what? Message! Meaning!! Thought!!! Of course, the thought in beginning speech work will not make either Plato or Einstein turn green with envy. In the process of learning to speak well, Demosthenes, if report be true, told the wild waves a lot of things hardly worth preservation, before he gave to the world his Philippics. The 'how' and the 'what' cannot be divorced in good speech training. . . . .

The word elocution, unfortunately, has fallen into disrepute. But elocution, as defined by Alfred Ayres, is exactly one of the objectives of speech teachers. Ayres said, "Elocution is the art of speaking language so as to make the thought it expresses clear and impressive." Would that all teachers of interpretative reading and dramatics would seek to understand and then grapple that concept to their very souls. . . .

Shakespeare in Hoosier or Bowery or Cockney would be a sorry thing from an esthetic point of view, but Gertrude Stein is a sorrier thing even though she be rendered in the best South Kensington or Park Avenue.

In dramatics, a lack of the art of speech is likely to be camouflaged with extravagant scenic effects. This is "from the purpose of playing." If theatre art is to be good art, elocution must be taught. I believe that on the whole, college dramatics exhibit their greatest weakness in the matter of the reading of lines. . . .

In so many colleges, departments are so jealous of their fields and of each other that they not only resent but prevent the granting of advanced degrees in the fields of the exact and social sciences through the department of speech. One university, at the request of the psychology department, refused its speech department the privilege of inviting a nationally eminent teacher of speech to join the summer session staff because he was a trained psychologist and would have lectured on the psychology of speech—all of which would have been unfair to the psychology department! Impede educational progress but don't be unfair to the psychology department! In some cases, even modern language departments have tried to hold a corner on phonetics. . . .

And mind, we must be "doers of the word," not teachers only. Time was—and not in the too dim past either—when one of the best places to find speech—shall we be euphemistic and say, not at its best—was conventions of teachers of speech. Poor communication in any phase should have no place in such a convention.

JOSEPH F. SMITH, *University of Utah*

STATISTICS AND EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURE

Editor of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH:

For those of us who find value in statistical and experimental techniques devised for analysis of factors underlying the audience-speaker relationship, the last issue of the QUARTERLY JOURNAL contains two articles of especial interest; one, because of the experimental procedure employed; the other for its statistical method.

In one article by R. N. Thompson (pages 403-405), the statistical method of averages was used for comparison of groups in an attempt to ascertain the relation between the intelligence of one hundred high school debaters and their success in winning debates. His most significant differences in average I.Q. for three groups were (page 405):

	1st Group	2nd Group	3rd Group
Average I.Q.	122.7	118.6	115.
% Debates Won	82.3	55.3	37.7

He concludes from such data as this that—

1. "Successful debaters can seldom be picked from the lower half of the class with an average I.Q. much below 117.

2. "Generally speaking, the higher the I.Q. the better the brand of debating.
3. "In general, the better the success of the debating team the higher their intelligence.
"It would seem from this study that in most cases a debate coach might well limit his initially picked squad to those having an I.Q. of 117 or better, if he is working for victories for his school."

Without discussion of the questionable standards involved in the last clause of this statement, it seems pertinent to examine the validity of the data upon which it is based.

The reasoning proceeds upon the assumption that the average I.Q. for groups is a practically fixed and constant category. But, unfortunately for this assumption, in even large groups of over one thousand members, the average I.Q. for a given group will fluctuate on retests about five points in either direction. With small groups (as in this instance, about thirty-three or thirty-four students), the fluctuation in average I.Q. may be much greater, to the extent of thirty-five or forty I.Q. It is obvious then, that there can be no significant difference in the I.Q. of the three groups studied, since the variation on a retest might turn Group No. 3 into Group No. 1, and No. 1 below 117 I.Q., so that the data indicates in fact exactly the opposite conclusion to that drawn by Mr. Thompson—I.Q. of the debater apparently bears little relation to "success" in debates, since there is no significant difference in I. Q. between the groups studied.

The reasoning proceeds also on the assumption that the "one hundred different debaters," a "broad geographical sampling," are representative of the general run of high school debaters. Quite aside from the question of whether each group of thirty-three or thirty-four was representative of the special class (those winning a definite percentage of debates or having a certain average I.Q.), certain fundamental statistical precautions have been neglected by Mr. Thompson. Whenever a small number is taken as representative of a group concerning which generalization is to be made, there arises the question of the reliability of the average. We ought to know the probable amount of deviation from the true measure which would be obtainable if we could examine every member of the more general population; how near does the obtained average of the sample come

to approximating the actual average of a more general group? This reliability of the average depends upon: (1) the number of the cases actually examined, and, (2) the variability or spread of the measures within the sample. The addition of one or more extra measures to a series will change the average; and, if the separate measures scatter widely from the average, we cannot say where the cases in the general group which we have not measured will probably fall. Mr. Thompson fails to give to us any of the measures of variability of his sample, though definite statistical measures exist for estimating the variability of measures in relation to the mean; the best of these, of course, is the standard deviation. In addition, definite statistical measures exist by which we can estimate the probable divergence of the obtained measure from the true measure of the group (sigma of the average).

Since the averages are not equal, the relative variability of the groups should be compared (probably, to the best advantage with Pearson's Coefficient of Variation). Comparison should also include the amount of "over-lapping" in each group; what percent of each group reaches or exceeds the median of the other? Then, too, what is the reliability of the *difference* between the two averages? How do we know it is not a chance difference? Here, also, a definite statistical measure exists (sigma or P.E. of Difference), by which we can determine the probability that the obtained difference approximates the true difference.

These are elementary principles to be found in any standard text on statistical method. They cannot be ignored when statistical methods are used for comparison of groups. Without the standard deviation, the coefficient of variation, the measures of reliability of the average and of differences, the data given can have no significance to serve as a means of classification and description; without statistical treatment, we have no means of discounting the sampling error.

Criticism should be directed also at the criterion of "success" in debating—the "% of debates won." Quite aside from the fact that this is hardly a laboratory or scientific criterion in the present state of the judging system (!), we are not told whether the one hundred debaters were alone in winning or losing or served with other colleagues who were not sampled. If unsampled colleagues helped win or lose the debates, what was their average I.Q.? What proportion did the debaters who were sampled contribute to wining or losing?

We are not told how the criterion was determined upon nor how it was applied.

THE METHOD OF QUESTIONNAIRE

The method of personal questionnaire is proposed by C. E. Lyon (pp. 375-385), in order to ascertain the "student's experience, as nearly as he can describe it or explain it, with audience-consciousness during preparation and delivery" (p. 383). The method of questionnaire was first employed by Galton in his study of imagery toward the end of the nineteenth century, but it has since fallen into disrepute as an experimental or laboratory procedure. No means exist for controlling the variables involved, or for giving definite quantitative and objective evaluation to results. Further, as to the introspective method involved, the attempt to remember what went on "in experience" during a speech is not likely to lead to very significant results if the speaker has not had his attention directed to noting his experience during the actual speaking; and if the speaker has his attention directed, while speaking, to whether he has "audience-consciousness" or not, he is no longer a fair sample of the average speaker who does not bother himself with such self-perplexing questions as—"Do I have audience-consciousness?". I imagine that Titchener would have thrown up his hands in horror if anyone had proposed to rely upon the tabulated results of introspective reports from untrained students as to their "audience-consciousness" during preparation and delivery of a speech. His experience in the laboratory indicated that some people are incapable of valid experimental introspection, and that the reports of those untrained in the method were valueless as a basis for scientific conclusions. A large group of psychologists has discarded the entire method of introspection as an instrument of investigation. They regard it solely as a means of further substantiating data obtained by more valid means.

These two articles indicate a desirable trend in the speech field. Unhappily, also, they illustrate the two chief dangers which threaten attempts to apply experimental procedures in a new field—failure to employ controlled experimental technique, and failure to apply adequately statistical method in interpretation of data. Led by experimental workers in Voice, Phonetics, and Speech Correction, we are beginning to widen our horizon beyond the library and the classroom to include the laboratory. It is quite natural that our first few

steps, toward experimental analysis of the factors underlying the audience-speaker relationship, should be faltering and wayward.

We will save a great deal of time and, perhaps, prestige, if we make ourselves better acquainted with the experimental and statistical findings and the methods already developed and at hand in the related fields of sociology, political science, and psychology. We are ten or twenty years behind our social science cousins in applying scientific methods to the problem of audience-psychology and public opinion; but we can, at least, avoid their mistakes. There is good reason for the recent warning of Professor Robert West that within the next generation our standing in the academic world will be high or low in exact accord with the extent to which we devote ourselves to scientific, rather than to pseudo-scientific, methods.

WILLIAM A. D. MILLSON,
Western Reserve University,
Cleveland, Ohio.

GEORGE WASHINGTON'S BICENTENNIAL

Editor of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH:

In connection with the celebration in 1932 of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of George Washington, there will be a series of Educational Contests—Declamatory in the elementary grades, Essay in the high schools, and Oratorical in the colleges. Each State Bicentennial Commission is appointing a special Educational Contest Committee to conduct contests in its state. We want the general plans to fit into the machinery now in operation for conducting school contests in the various states.

We realize that each state has channels that have been used for carrying on state-wide contests in all types of schools, whether it be through the extension divisions of the institutions of higher learning, divisions of the State Teachers Association, or Department of Education or other groups.

Naturally in the Nation-wide Contests there must be uniformity in the suggested subjects for the Essay and Oratorical Contests as well as the selections for the Declamatory Contests. A pamphlet will be published and distributed by the Commission which contains the selections for the Declamatory Contest. Another pamphlet will be distributed to the teachers throughout the Nation containing the organization and general rules of the contests.

The organization work in each state is left to the State Contest Committee. This will include the time for the contests—try-outs, elimination district and state; selection of judges, and local and state awards. The Declamatory Contest will be carried on through the state, while the Essay and Oratorical Contests will be carried on to a National Contest. The Federal Commission will present medals to the winners of the National Contest as well as the winners of the State Contests.

We realize that the teachers of your association can be of great assistance in the promotion of the contests and the organization work. We hope that the state committees will soon be appointed so that the organization work may be started in every state.

We would appreciate receiving from you a list of the Chairmen of the Teachers of Speech in every state as well as the present officials in Regional Associations that have been formed, and the states included in the regions.

We are sending you a copy of the Handbook of George Washington Appreciation Course. This contains an outlined study of the life and achievements of George Washington and the period in which he lived as well as units emphasizing the outstanding features of the Nation's Capital and the correlation of the Course with the subjects of the elementary curriculum. Although the Handbook has been prepared especially for students pursuing the Course in a teacher training institution, nevertheless, it may be used by teachers in the field or any adult who wishes to pursue a definite study of the life of George Washington.

We realize that the schools of the Nation will have a very vital part in the Bicentennial Celebration and we want to be of service to them. We are having excellent response from all sections of the United States. The early plans that are being made assure active participation for the Bicentennial year.

Very sincerely yours,

SOL BLOOM,

Representative in Congress and Associate Director, U. S. Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of George Washington.

WHEN TO LEARN LINES

Editor of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH:

I have read from time to time in articles and books on acting, play production, and directing, statements that the lines of a play should be memorized not later than the second, or third, or possibly the fourth rehearsal. Such statements are ambiguous, inasmuch as the number of rehearsals, the length of rehearsals, and the methods of directors vary. Yet a principle is involved.

Do the writers mean literally, that lines should be learned at the very start of rehearsals, or do they mean that this is an ideal condition? Whichever their meaning, I challenge it.

If lines are arbitrarily learned at the beginning of rehearsals, the production must inevitably suffer. Such a theory of rehearsals will result only in wrong reading of lines, in stiff and mechanical interpretation of character and action. And if the actor is a novice, it will give him the notion that acting is merely memorizing lines. There is too much of this kind of production already, without increasing it by publishing such statements. Even if the learning of lines at the beginning, is an ideal to which the actor is expected periodically to pay humble tribute in the hope that he may actually learn his lines by first performance, the principle is wrong. Such a point of view merely admits the failure of the director.

It is not safe to dogmatize about when lines should be learned—at the beginning, in the middle, or at the end of the rehearsal process, but we can find a more satisfactory guide than an arbitrary rule of thumb. The method must vary with the type of play. A mystery play, with surface characterization and complex plot, demands that the lines be learned comparatively early, for the lines are less difficult than the business. Similarly, the chorus of a Greek tragedy; the lines must serve as the base for the rhythm, movement, and music. On the other hand, in a problem play, the depth and range of emotions, and the nuances of thought are the most important and difficult. Hence the characterization should first be worked out; then the emotional reactions to each situation, expressed through voice, gesture and pantomime. Only then, after these have been mastered, should lines be memorized. In other words, each case must be determined by itself.

In my opinion, lines should rarely be learned at the beginning; in very few instances do they need to be mastered by a *tour de force*. Generally they should learn themselves. This means that the director has as much to do with the learning of lines as has the actor who learns them. If the director sees to it, that character, emotion, action, relationship—i.e., significance of the detail to the whole—tempo, and many other things, are put into each speech or movement as it is rehearsed, the lines will memorize themselves. Generally, words evolve from character, situation, emotion and movement, and not vice versa.

WALTER H. TRUMBAUER,
Alabama State College for Women

FLORIDA PLAY CONTEST

Editor of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH:

In the May issue of the SPEECH BULLETIN appeared an interesting and valuable article by Clara E. Krefting of Baker University on the various state high school one-act play contests. Eighteen contests, which purported to be the only ones so far organized in the country, were described. The article was based on material used in a graduate thesis in 1930.

Since the Florida high school one-act play contest, which was organized in 1929-30, follows a somewhat broader plan than that of most of the organizations summarized in the article, a resume of the competition may be interesting to the readers of the QUARTERLY JOURNAL. The registration is not limited to any number of schools, no registration fee or dues are required, a loan library of plays is maintained so that coaches may examine plays without the expense of purchasing a great number, and a series of elimination competitions is held so that no cast has to travel over seventy-five miles except those entering the State finals at the University.

The Florida contest was launched in the fall of 1929 as a part of the Interscholastic Contest program which has been sponsored for several years by the General Extension Division of the University of Florida. Consequently, general policies had been worked out, and the machinery was already in operation. That there was a demand for such a contest is shown by the fact that another play contest for the high schools of the State was organized about the same

time. Southern College, a private school, sponsors this competition which is limited to nine schools. Experience in this State agrees with that in other sections that the field for amateur drama is underestimated.

The first year, forty-two schools took part in the contest, the second year fifty-six participated. This is twenty-five per cent of the accredited white high schools of Florida. That the competition is of wide appeal is shown, too, by the fact that two schools of enrollments of sixty-five pupils each participated as did the largest high school of the State with its 1851 students.

Sectional and then district tournaments are held previous to the finals at the University the first week in March. By that time the competing schools have been reduced to eight. A trophy is presented the school whose cast succeeds in winning first place, and a gold medal goes to the best individual actor in the State Tournament.

In 1930 the winning cast presented "Thank You, Doctor," by Emery, and the runner-up was "The Valiant," by Hall and Middlemass. In 1931 the winning play was Paul Green's "No 'Count Boy," and the second was "The End of the Trail," by Culbertson.

The General Extension Division must approve all plays presented, and the playing time for each must not exceed forty-five minutes, but these are the only restrictions on material. It may be that too much latitude has been given the schools, and in 1932, while the time limit remains the same, it is probable that the presentation of comedies and farces only will be allowed.

At all tournaments the plays are presented on stages new to players and coaches, with no opportunity for rehearsal, and with properties which are assembled for the use of all casts alike. Each group is responsible for all other properties required for its production. It was expected that at tournaments which included eight or ten plays there would be a good deal of confusion in the handling of properties and delay in setting the stage for groups of plays which had not been presented together before. Neither difficulty has arisen to any extent. Shifts in sets are slower than they would be with rehearsal but are accomplished easily when each coach is made responsible for the management of the crew which is to set her play. In order to eliminate as far as possible unfair advantage to schools with more money to spend on production that others, casts in a tournament must use the set or cyclorama available for all.

The greatest difficulty in this as in other interscholastic contests in Florida is the lack of competent and experienced judges, and their inexperience with the low-point-total system of judging. The latter difficulty may be peculiar to the State; the first seems to be fairly common, and needs attention in any state which attempts as complete a dramatic contest program as that outlined here.

BERNICE ASHBURN, *General Extension Division, University of Florida, Gainesville.*

THE AMERICAN ACADEMY'S CAMPAIGN FOR BETTER SPEECH

Editor of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH:

No one who has spent even so much as a summer in London, Paris, or Rome can fail of recognizing that the rasping, strident, assertive "American accent," which so offends cultivated Europeans, is a national characteristic. In railway stations, steamboat offices, banks and express offices the tourist from "the states" makes his birth-place known the moment he begins to speak.

Many times during my four summers in England, I heard Americans thus proclaim themselves. It was not so much a question of faulty pronounciation as of strident tone. They pronounced their words as correctly and articulated as well as or better than the English clerks who sneered at them, but their voices were nasal and piercing. Often the men spoke as those who have no secrets from the crowd, others used a bullying tone.

At banquets where I heard American orators alternating with English speakers, I was forced to admit that while my countrymen were more adroit, more fluent, the English speakers had the better tone. Their voices were quietly melodious, whereas the Americans sounded raw and harsh.

At one such dinner, given in honor of an American preacher, I sat beside the secretary of the Club while its guest gave an eloquent address. At the close of the speech the secretary turned to me and said, "Admirably done—very eloquent indeed, but my ears ache with his dreadful American voice." To this I was forced to reply, "Yes, his voice is unworthy of him."

Why should there be a dreadful American voice? Why continue to offend not only the cultivated ears of the old world, but the cultivated ears of the new world? Is there any virtue in being unpleasantly distinctive?

We grant that there are certain standards of pronunciation. We have dictionaries which agree concerning the correct articulation of words, and the stress of syllables, and our students are all taught to speak in accordance with these rules, but as very little attention is given to the quality of tone in which the words are uttered, the voices remain uncultivated.

Some races have naturally musical voices, our negroes for example. In spite of the grotesque English which many of them use, they have a soft, flowing, wistful utterance. The Irish, especially those of the south of Ireland, have a delightful timbre. But in spite of America's many schools of speech the voices of our orators retain a whang, and excellent teachers of written English are often faulty users of spoken English. As instructors they still retain the unpleasant peculiarities of their "bringing up."

I am privileged to be this frank for the reason that I am one of those who suffer from lack of early training. I was educated in a little school house on the Iowa prairie and am still handicapped (after sixty years of study) by the strident quality which I caught from the speech of my pioneer neighbors and my schoolmates.

The truth is, most of us are sons and daughters of villagers or farmers. We have the defects of our schooling, and so far as my observation goes (and I travel widely among universities) little is being done to correct the flat tone and insistent "r's" which most of our students bring to our colleges and which many of them retain and carry into public life, for the voices of their professors are almost as unmusical as their own.

This strident American quality is not a characteristic to be proud of. I am patriotic, but not so patriotic as that. I am not ready to defend our manner of speech.

And it was in the hope of aiding in the campaign for better speech that I suggested to the American Academy four years ago the establishment of a medal for good diction on the radio. As it had already established a medal for good diction on the stage, I felt that it could very properly go farther and make of the announcer an exemplar.

As Chairman of the Radio Committee of the Academy I put the problem up to Mr. John W. Elwood of the National Broadcasting Company and to Major Andrew White of the Columbia Broadcasting System, the two largest chains of radio stations in the country.

With their cooperation we were able at once to make a nation-wide appeal for higher standards of announcing. Their interest in reporting the results of each audition has enabled us to reach millions of listeners. One of these officials said, "The American Academy has raised the business of announcing to the level of an art."

We are soon to close our third audition and from all sides we hear that the Academy's medal has brought a general improvement in the voices as well as in the taste and skill of our announcers. Good announcers are now to be heard on most stations, and hundreds of even those in smaller stations are earnestly seeking a finer utterance.

The rules governing the contest are few. Only regular paid announcers of radio stations are eligible. All contestants are judged while at their regular duties, and rated according to their pronunciation, their articulation, their freedom from local accent, their tone quality, and the general cultural effect of their utterance.

The medal has been twice awarded; the first recipient was Milton Cross and the second Alwyn Bach. The third award will be given at the annual meeting of the Academy on November twelfth. The first medal for good diction on the stage went to Walter Hampden—but last year, taking into account the enormous influence of the "talking film" the Committee awarded the medal to George Arliss whose voice now reached more listeners than any other actor. It may be that the radio Committee may somehow widen the scope of the radio audition and include occasional as well as regular speakers to the microphone, but for the present the regular paid announcers of radio stations will be the only recognized competitors.

Some years ago I attended the Eisteddifod at Carnarvon in Wales, where some six or seven church choirs were singing for a prize, and I was surprised and somewhat dismayed to find that they were all called upon to sing the same selection. This was a little hard on those of the auditors who had come for entertainment, but for the judges no other arrangement could have brought out so clearly the comparative merits of each performance. All attention was focused on *how* they sang unmixed with any consideration of

what they sang. I wish a somewhat similar scheme could end our third radio audition. I should like to have five or six of the leading announcers brought into competition at the same hour and assigned selections from the Declaration of Independence, or some such classic. With such an arrangement my committee of award would be able to judge each man on his technical merits and in contrast with his fellows.

This, however, is impracticable for the reason that commercial programs cannot be shifted, but we are asking several of the leading stations to designate their best men and allow them to put forward their best programs. This will not be quite so direct a contest as in the case of the choirs but it will approximate it, and it will make it easier for us to distinguish the voices and to arrive at a decision. Whether this is done or not, we hope the readers of this magazine will listen to the programs during October and send in a straw vote.

HAMLIN GARLAND, *Chairman,*
Radio Committee of American Academy

SUSTAINING MEMBERSHIP

The 1930 Chicago Convention amended the Constitution of our NATIONAL ASSOCIATION to provide for a new type of membership with annual dues of ten dollars a year instead of the regular two dollars and a half. Those who become sustaining members under the terms of this amendment will be entitled to all of the rights and privileges of regular members and in addition will receive the issues of the *Speech Bulletin* and of the *Research Monographs* which appear within the term of their membership.

In adopting this plan, our Association has followed the practice of many other academic societies. Our officers always face a pressing need for funds, and it is hoped that the additional income from sustaining memberships will make possible a larger activity on the part of our important committees and the publication, under the auspices of our Committee on Research, of some of our recent scholarly work. Those who are in a position to under-write their share of such projects should feel their obligation to do so, should immediately communicate with Executive Secretary G. E. Densmore at the

University of Michigan, and become sustaining members of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION.

Up to the time of this issue's going to press, the following had become sustaining members. The Executive Secretary reports that applications for this new type of membership are continuing to reach him and it is hoped that the list published herewith may be greatly augmented by convention time. A supplementary list of those whose applications reach the secretary before January 1, 1931, will appear in the February number of the JOURNAL.

Amy V. Allen
Lyndon Institute
Lyndon Center, Vermont

Margaret Althouse
Ackley High School
Ackley, Iowa

Sara Barber
Richmond High School
New York City

L. E. Bassett
Stanford University
Palo Alto, California

Dorothy Baxter
Ford Republic
Farmington, Michigan

Dr. C. S. Bluemel
Physician
Denver, Colorado

Gladys Borchers
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin

W. N. Brigance
Wabash College
Crawfordsville, Indiana

Earl C. Bryan
Texas State College for Women
Denton, Texas

Therese Cavanaugh
124 Pair St.
Paterson, New Jersey

Rupert Cortright
Detroit City College
Detroit, Michigan

C. C. Cunningham
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois

Annette Lucille Cusack
John Adams High School
New York City

Mary Cryan
Detroit Public Schools
Detroit, Michigan

Ralph Dennis
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois

G. E. Densmore
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

John Dolman, Jr.
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

A. M. Drummond
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York

Louis M. Eich
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

H. L. Ewbank
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin

Annie Kate Ferguson
Sul Ross State Teachers College
Alpine, Texas

John Frizzell
Pennsylvania State College
State College, Pennsylvania

Dorothea Fry
John Muir Technical High School
Pasadena, California

Joseph M. Galvin
1015 Masonic Ave.
San Francisco, California

Wilbur E. Gilman
University of Missouri
Columbia, Missouri

Guy S. Green
Iowa State College
Ames, Iowa

Alta Hall
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, California

B. T. Hanley
New Orleans School of Speech
New Orleans, Louisiana

C. H. Harshbarger
University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

Violet Hassler
The Stout Institute
Menomonie, Wisconsin

Howard Higgins
Miami University
Oxford, Ohio

R. K. Immel
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, California

Huron D. Johnson
Pekin High School
Pekin, Illinois

S. L. Kennedy
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York

Carroll P. Lahman
Western State Teachers College
Kalamazoo, Michigan

Anne Larkin
Columbia College of Expression
Chicago, Illinois

Azubah Latham
Columbia University
New York City

Edward Mabie
University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

Mrs. Bertha Jackson MacKay
California Christian College
Los Angeles, California

J. H. McBurney
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Elizabeth D. McDowell
Columbia University
New York City

Eleanor McLellan
33 West 67th St.
New York City

Frederick McKay
Ypsilanti State Teachers College
Ypsilanti, Michigan

Roberta McWade
170 Plymouth Ave.
Schenectady, N. Y.

Elizabeth Morse
Morse School of Expression
St. Louis, Missouri

Henry M. Moser
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Dorothy I. Mulgrave
New York University
New York City

Richard Murphy
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

The Pacific University Library
Forest Grove, Oregon

J. M. O'Neill
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Edwin Paget
North Carolina State College
Raleigh, North Carolina

T. Earl Pardoe
Brigham Young University
Provo, Utah

G. R. R. Pflaum
Emporia State Teachers College
Emporia, Kansas

Henrietta Prentiss
Hunter College
New York City

F. M. Rarig
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota

J. Walter Reeves
The Peddie School
Hightstown, New Jersey

Lillian J. Reifsteck
School of Self Expression Speech and Acting
Joplin, Missouri

Floyd K. Riley
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Paul J. Ritter
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, California

Vladimir Rottenbor
Tucker School of Expression
Cleveland, Ohio

J. P. Ryan
Grinnell College
Grinnell, Iowa

Preston H. Scott
College of the City of Detroit
Detroit, Michigan

Rolland Shackson
Junior College
Grand Rapids, Michigan

Clarence T. Simon
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois

Irene Skinner
Columbia College of Expression
Chicago, Illinois

E. J. Spadino
1272 Amsterdam Ave.
New York City

Speech Arts Association
Los Angeles, California

Maude Stillson
1422 Maplewood Ave.
Flint, Michigan

Jane Bliss Taylor
Hunter College
New York City

S. Elizabeth Tyson
State Teachers College
West Chester, Pennsylvania

Gertrude Van Adestine
150 Atkinson St.
Detroit, Michigan

Helen Vergason
Franklin K. Lane High School
Brooklyn, New York

R. B. Wagner
St. Louis University
St. Louis, Missouri

Russell A. Wagner
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York

Jean Walker
University of Western Ontario
London, Ontario, Canada

A. T. Weaver
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin

J. Dale Welsch
Elkader Junior College
Elkader, Iowa

H. A. Wichelns
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York

Marjorie Will
Private Studio
San Antonio, Texas

J. A. Winans
Dartmouth College
Hanover, New Hampshire

H. S. Woodward
Western Reserve University
Cleveland, Ohio

NEW BOOKS

A First Course in Public Speaking: with Debating and Oral Reading. By James Albert Winans and Hoyt Hopewell Hudson. The Century Company, New York and London, 1931. Pp. xvii, 349.

Since its publication in 1915 no textbook in the field has been submitted to more frequent pillaging than Winan's *Public Speaking* (Century Company), and no other book has so richly deserved the compliment. Now the author has done some canny "lifting" himself with the very able assistance of Professor Hudson, with the result that we have a text for secondary schools which is sure to be as popular in its field as the older work has been in colleges and universities.

The authors intend that the book shall be of special use to students in the third or fourth year of high school or preparatory school, and they have in mind those who will not go on to college as well as those who will continue scholastic life. One suggested use is for a year's course meeting five times a week. In general it may be said in high praise of the book that it meets the recommendations of Professor Drummond's *Course of Study in Speech Training and Public Speaking for Secondary Schools* (Century Company), published for the National Association of Teachers of Speech not long ago; indeed, that valuable manual is recommended as a guide in the use of the present text.

Of course, instruction in speech is becoming more and more extensive in some secondary schools, but it will be hard to find another single text which meets more of the varied demands. Chapters I to X cover what used to be called Public Speaking; Chapters XI to XIV will do for Argumentation and Debate; Chapters XV to XX may be used for work in Oral Reading. That leaves Dramatics and technical Voice-Training for the experts, and so leaves unattempted the futile task of unscrewing the inscrutable. All the way through the book the emphasis is upon the presentation of original

thinking; upon their success in directing that activity, the authors will probably rest their case.

From what has just been said, it may be supposed that this is merely an abridgment of Professor Winans' earlier work, but such is by no means the case. That *magnum opus* reminds me of the delicate rebuke by a French critic of Samuel Richardson's lengthy romances, "There is an unpardonable ostentation of talent." With the aid of his collaborator the author has cut much needless repetition, until the present volume, in spite of the added material for debate and oral reading, is reduced from 526 pages to 349, with the loss of no important feature. The treatment of Persuasion is still somewhat inflated; there are chapters on "Persuasion—Influencing Conduct" and on "Gaining Belief—Persuasion," whose mere titles make one dizzy. On the other hand, the authors have properly lengthened the chapter on "The Expository Speech" to a size which its importance demands. The arrangement, also, has been greatly improved, so that the reader is not continually popping in and out of Mr. Winans' favorite subjects of Attention, Interest, and Imagination, but is permitted to go forward in a straight path. There are also various new inducements to youthful attention in the way of recent anecdotes and examples, together with interesting pictures of Hughes, Bryan, Coolidge, Wilson, and Roosevelt in action.

Some of the profession who borrow dignity from the swallowing and regurgitation of recent psychologies will be shocked to find that Messrs. Winans and Hudson still put their main reliance upon William James. It can and should be said in their defence that James was the last psychologist who wrote English, and that both of the present authors are prejudiced in favor of that tongue, though their own style is sometimes more remarkable for clarity than for elegance. After all, modern psychology has more to learn from a course in public speaking, however elementary, than public speaking has to learn from psychology. The psychology of Winans was sound in the days of Cicero, and it will be sound in the days of the last Roosevelt, when the Hamilton-Cornell tradition in public speaking shall perish with civilization.

Inasmuch as there is no reviewer, even in discussing a classic, who cannot suggest improvements, I should like to say that the authors are urgently requested to add in the next edition a chapter on speeches for special occasions, including at least the following

types: the after-dinner speech, the eulogy, the speech of welcome, the presentation speech, and the introduction of a lecturer. That such subjects can be treated briefly and concretely in a text intended for secondary schools has been proved by Miss Antoinette Knowles in her *Oral English* (D. C. Heath); and Messrs. Winans and Hudson cannot throw dust by claiming that a knowledge of general principles of speaking is all that is required in producing any type of speech. The after-dinner speech, for example, is the one most feared by all my students and friends—yes, even when they are the speakers—and the rules are not merely venerable Principles of Attention in a new guise. In Britain I have been told again and again that Americans excel at after-dinner speaking. For professional reasons I should hate to believe that the one form at which we excel is the one not taught by teachers of speech.

A last word of criticism concerns the province of this book. The authors intended it for secondary schools. For obvious reasons, including the fact that it is a better book than its predecessor, it will undoubtedly be adopted in those colleges and schools specially interested in the training of teachers; I myself am using it this year in the summer session of the New York State College for Teachers. Now suppose that a high school graduate, taught Winans in the high school by a teacher from a college where Winans is acknowledged, comes to you in college or university. Shall you give him Winans over again? Or must Hudson and Winans map out a new world?

HAROLD W. THOMPSON, *New York State College for Teachers*

Debate and Oral Discussion. By JAMES O'NEILL AND RUPERT L. CORTRIGHT. New York: The Century Company, 1931.

The evolution of the creative speech curriculum in our secondary schools during the past four decades has been a process hampered rather than helped by an influx into the field of many mediocre manuals and carelessly constructed textbooks. As we have promoted forensics from the hazy realm of elocutionary absurdity into harmony with the saner, more practical concept of speech as a vital human communicative function, we who train high school students have had to search for texts that meet the demand of adequacy sans superfluity.

For a high school class in practical augmentation, a discussion club interested in debate and parliamentary procedure, or a forum group concerned with the cultivation of skills in controversial discourse, the contents of *Debate and Oral Discussion* will be found sufficient without tedious attention to subordinate details. Its organization and subject matter are particularly adapted to a correlation of a high school course in argumentation with the interschool contest program. The material is presented in the proper chronology for that period of training during which the director is preparing his contestants.

In the Introduction the authors have aptly included a bit about terminology with modern definitions of terms and forms. Illustrative of the concise simplicity of the treatment is the definition of a debate as "a direct oral contest on a given proposition between two opposing sides at a given time and place."

The next section of the book, given to the study of formal organizations and their conduct, presents with a remarkable degree of clarity the intricate matters of business order, motions and their treatment, officers and committees, and (in the appendices) explanation of constitution construction, an outline of the purpose of motions and a table of motions showing rank, precedence, etc. In fact, chapter II of the book, with accompanying exercises, would serve the literary or political club with more practical comprehensible information and guidance than many of the more complicated manuals too frequently attempted.

In chapter III, "Propositions," the authors have avoided the common confusion of the debate proposition with the discussion "question" by emphasizing the fact that a proposition is an assertion to be maintained (as stated) by the affirmative. Ten requirements of a good proposition are cited along with some guidance in phraseology. Suggestion is offered that propositions should be pertinent to the students' own experiences and interests. No list of ready-made propositions is included in the book. The omission is commendable.

Varied types and the (supposedly) more recent modifications of the traditional procedure in debate are discussed (mercifully) in chapter IV. An "analytical mind" is essential to the successful debater. Industry likewise is important. Chapters V and VI present the problems of proposition dissection, analysis, finding issues, brief

construction, investigation and exhaustion of sources of evidence with preparation and preservation of notes.

Given similar ability in the mastery of words and the capture of audience interest, the team with the better evidence wins the debate. Discrimination in the selection of evidence is possible by applying tests outlined in chapter VII. Questions as to the qualifications of witnesses and authority are discussed with an almost legal formality that will fascinate the young student.

In chapter VIII, "Reasoning," the forms of argument are presented with a parallel discussion of methods of attack in refuting each. This two-fold treatment makes it possible for the student to strengthen his logic against anticipated attack and prepare to destroy the reasoning of his opponents. The authors have not gone deeply into the science of logic, nor have they dodged it completely.

Chapter IX, "Construction," deals with the composition of the debate speech. Beginning with chapter X the authors have concerned themselves chiefly with the presentation of the prepared debate. Qualities of personality which make for general effectiveness in the art of persuasion and audience adaptation are stressed. In this chapter the matter of audience appeal and speaker-listener contacts are dealt with in some detail. Whereas a deficiency in this respect is generally to be noted in debate textbooks, in the present book there is positively no deficiency.

In the concluding (four) chapters of the text the authors have treated the problems most vital to debating proper; refutation, team work, delivery, procedure and decision. The advantages of the extemporized speech are lauded and its dangers are enumerated, i.e., inaccuracy, repetition, monotony, poor judgment, etc. The advantages of the extemporaneous method, the authors point out, sufficiently outweigh the disadvantages or possible faults.

At the close of the chapter on "Decision" a sample criticism blank for a judge of debate is reprinted. The form is interesting and might serve to insure more just and more beneficial evaluations for contests.

The appendices of the book contain practical "suggestions for programs and exercises of club or class," "Discussion and Extemporaneous Speaking Contests," and "Suggestions to the Director," all of which are valuable aids to the teacher. Pertinent quotations at the beginning of some chapters add a spice to the work that the writer

of this review finds particularly enjoyable. One in particular, it seems to me, suggests the attitude of the authors toward debating and public discussion in general. It is from Aristotle's *Rhetoric*:

> "Our facts ought to be our sole weapons, making everything superfluous which is outside the proof; owing to the infirmities of the hearer, however, style, as we have said, can do much."

J. HENRY HEDLEY, *Dodge City (Kansas) Senior High School*

The Short Speech. By JAMES THOMPSON BAKER. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1928; pp. xvii, 315.

The author of this book calls it in his sub-title "A Handbook on the Various Types." It is not meant to be a complete treatise on public speaking, but an aid to the busy man, including the business man, author, teacher, and student (strange bedfellows!) who have varied kinds of speeches to give. While five chapters deal with general principles of speaking, twenty-two have to do with various types of speeches or speech-situations.

When we consider these twenty-two kinds of speeches, a strange sort of confusion appears. Here are our old friends, speeches of introduction, nomination, dedication, the after-dinner speech, and the like; but here are some new, or at least unexpected ones: making the announcement; speaking to children; speaking to old folks; speaking to college students; the commencement speech (can this be a short speech?); the short debate speech; the short oration. Here is variety of speech with a vengeance. A division according to occasion, according to purpose, or according to the function of the hearers, one could understand; one could even tolerate these kinds being lumped together, though some systematized grouping in separate categories would be preferable; but in this book the overlapping of types is disconcerting. Thus, one might, at one time, be making a religious speech (Chap. XXI), to children, (XXII), at a farewell occasion (XIX).

We should expect this work to answer the question of how the short speech differs from the ordinary public speech. There is no question that speeches of today are shorter than formerly. But are they of a different *genre*, requiring a changed technique? We should not expect much on this subject in the chapters on various types, nor in the preliminary ones on voice, vocabulary building, and plat-

form manners. Here it is, a paragraph in the chapter on "Speech Demands of Today." "Remember it is a short speech," says the author, explaining that, (1) quotations must be short and to the point, (2) much material that has been gathered must be thrown away. No other distinguishing features of the short speech are mentioned. One is reconciled to speaking briefly by remembering that the greatest speeches almost invariably have been short—witness Webster, Phillips, *et al.* and the Gettysburg Address particularly.

It would seem, then, that the title of the book is a misnomer. Its function is to give in brief, simple form, a few general principles of public speaking, and more specific suggestions for many and various speech situations. "Hints for the Busy Speaker" would be a better title.

The advice the author gives is mainly good. There is no wandering after strange gods. Not much of methods or the reasons for doing as the author advises is included. Do's and don'ts sprinkle the pages frequently. It is to be feared that the many platitudes, the tendency to write down to the reader, to be sentimental, and to be too inspirational, will repel many who might otherwise profit by the book.

RUSSELL H. WAGNER, *Cornell University*

Charles Nagel: Speeches and Writings. Edited by OTTO HELLER. Limited edition printed by friends of the author. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1931; 2 vols.

This work, edited by the dean of the Graduate School of Washington University, is the tribute of more than 350 citizens of Missouri to the most generally admired leader in the state. During his 82 years Charles Nagel has been a member of the state legislature, president of the Council of St. Louis, Republican National Committeeman from Missouri, Secretary of Commerce and Labor in the Cabinet of President Taft, a founder of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, and chairman of the Business Men's Agricultural Commission created in 1926 by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States and the national Industrial Conference Board. He is an eminent lawyer, political leader, and educator.

For convenience, the editor has divided the material into five sections, "Government and Society," "The Processes of Govern-

ment," "The Government and Business," "On Eminent Americans," "The World War and After," and "Education." But these headings give only a hint of the variety of subjects Mr. Nagel has essayed. He has spoken on the growth of law, the Negro problem, charity and the state, minority legislation, the codification of international law, the immigration question, the regulation of commerce, internal waterways, the merchant marine, the liquor problem, the American college, Taft, Schurz, and Lincoln; and his articles and addresses between 1914 and 1928 form one of the most notable contributions by an American to the literature of the war.

I make this statement about his war speeches deliberately, because they contain, so far as I know, the clearest and most convincing answer to the letters of Walter Hines Page. Ambassador Page, believing that the United States was "yet English-led and English-ruled," bent all his efforts toward bringing this country into the war on the side of the Allies. Mr. Nagel, considering this country the home of an amalgamated people drawn from every nation of the earth, contended that the interests of the United States should not be identified with those of any belligerent. For three years he fought pro-British propaganda in all its forms, urging Americans to "keep both feet upon the platform of the United States." Like his own heroes, Burke, Fox, Schurz, and Trevelyan, he fought a losing battle. The son of a German immigrant who had been driven from Texas during the Civil War because of his loyalty to the Union, Mr. Nagel was denounced by the public and even by a Senate committee as a pro-German propagandist. But the record of that battle is a series of inspiring utterances.

I have sometimes thought that public speakers might be divided into two classes, those who study under rhetoricians and those whom rhetoricians study. Mr. Nagel belongs in the second group. His style has been molded by Burke and Lincoln because he has read their speeches earnestly in search of ideas. He has never, in his long career, shaped his convictions to fit the beliefs of an audience. His basic rhetorical device is to state those convictions with complete frankness and to support them with wide information and clear reasoning. He abhors showmanship and prefers to speak extemporaneously. "If I cannot speak of my subject with the same freedom before an audience that I would enjoy in my own household," he has said, "I do not care to discuss it at all."

G. P. Putnam's Sons contemplate the publication of a trade edition of Mr. Nagel's speeches and writings in the near future. The book should appeal to every student of modern public speaking. In my opinion, biased, perhaps, by the fact that Mr. Nagel is the esteemed chairman of the Board of Trustees of Washington University, some of his utterances during the war are the nearest approach in the past twenty years to the speeches of Abraham Lincoln. Let me give one short sample, taken from a speech in St. Louis on the day the United States joined the Allies:

> "Our war is not altogether a surprise to me. In anticipation of such a decision I have from the beginning made my plea for a united people. I have recognized that mobilization of a nation is not possible unless there is a united response to a nation's call. As I pleaded for a united people then, so I plead now, and shall continue to plead after the war, when our gravest problems will arise to confront us, for we shall then have to meet them on merit alone, without the inspiring stir of war's excitement.
>
> That my plea has so far largely failed, I have to admit. But I can take home this consolation: I have not thought or spoken of any race in a spirit of depreciation or enmity. I have asked for and extended tolerance and forbearance. I have not always received them. I can forgive where I have not been forgiven. But this is no time for soft words. This is the time for action. This is no time to throw stones. This is the time for united effort. Wounds have been wrought that will not be healed by the mere use of plaster, but this is no time to show them. Time enough for their treatment after the war. Then I, for one, shall trust that my patriotism may be tested by something more worthy and self-respecting than the renunciation of my ancestry; and then I shall say, as I say now to those who may doubt or hesitate: There is but one allegiance; this is our country; bitter duty well performed may prove to be the highest test of loyalty."

RAYMOND F. HOWES, *Washington University, St. Louis*

Argumentation and Debate (a High School Text). By Carl G. Miller. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1931; pp. 240; $1.40.

New high school speech texts are now appearing rather rapidly; Mr. Carl G. Miller of the Lewis and Clark High School, Spokane, Washington, has added this one in the field of debate. He was assisted in this work by Professor Edwin Paget of North Carolina State College and Mr. John A. McGee of Purdue University.

At the outset the author states that he has adapted the text to the problems in the daily life of high school students. In reading the book, this approach is quite evident, and it seems to me that he has in the main adhered to this end. The book, as a whole, seems well adapted to such factors in the life of students or, at least, is done well enough that it should hold the interest of the student in rather a pronounced way.

Some of the major points which should favorably attract the high school teacher, as well as the student, are these:

1. The terminology is mainly new, and well within the grasp of high school youth.

2. The explanatory material and illustrations are such as should draw his attention and maintain his interest.

3. The first application of the motivation process to debating principles is found here. This was first introduced by Professor Scott of Detroit and employed by McGee in his *Persuasive Speaking*. While there is disagreement as to the soundness of this approach, yet it is given a practical adaptation in this book, which should help establish or disprove the soundness of the innovation.

4. The suggested Projects should prove of decided value in establishing a clear idea of debating principles in the minds of the students, who should also find pleasure in doing them, as they are within the range of his major interests.

5. Another very fundamental innovation, and a very necessary one also, is a careful discussion and outline of the duties of each speaker on both the affirmative and negative teams.

6. There is a simple discussion of refutation. Students should really know how to pursue the various types of refutation tactics after reading the discussion in this text-book.

7. The book contains a chapter of suggestions for the teacher and coach; these should prove to be of material help, since they come from a fellow-teacher and are the results of his experience.

While I do not intend to convey the idea that the book is the perfect high school debate text, yet I do feel that the author has made a worthy contribution to this field; and the text merits a thorough class-room trial by teachers of debating. For, after all, this last is the true test of the value of such a book.

CLAUDE SIFRITT, *Butler University*

University Education for Business. By JAMES H. S. BOSSARD AND J. FREDERIC DEWHURST. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1931; pp. 578.

In their analysis and evaluation of university education for business, Professors Bossard and Dewhurst record much information about Public Speaking in business curricula, information which is at once interesting and challenging to the teacher of speech. The field of distribution, or merchandising, in which speech training should be important, attracts the largest proportion of graduates from colleges of business; the training and qualifications of the business man require the development of personality traits, the co-operative attitude, and "the capacity for effective oral and written expression . . . . The development of this facility on the part of students demands much more than formal courses in composition and public speaking, valuable as these courses may be; what is needed, apparently, is emphatic and continuous insistence upon the maintenance of high standards of expression throughout the entire course of study" (p. 118). In replies from something over sixteen hundred graduates of the Wharton school, "studies and practice in the oral and written use of the English language" more frequently received rankings of primary importance than the more strictly business subjects. Analysis of the recommendations of about one thousand graduates of the same school indicates that slightly over twelve per cent believed that training in oral and written English should receive greater emphasis in the curriculum. The training of students in clear and effective oral and written expression is correlative with the aim of Schools of Commerce,—training of students in habits of work and methods of thought. " 'Argumentation,' 'speech,' and 'public speaking' are

terms used to indicate another kind of course (in English) frequently found (in the curricula of Colleges of Business). . . . At nine schools, such courses are required . . . and . . . additional schools are now considering such a step. The importance of training of this kind is being emphasized increasingly in higher business education circles" (pp. 338-339).

And in the final chapter: "It is apparent that the student's opportunity for achieving a . . . useful career in business is greatly enhanced by the possession of certain personal traits and attitudes which enable him to work effectively with others in mutual enterprises. These traits of personality, which involve the capacity for influencing human behavior, may be in large part innate but insofar as they are susceptible of conscious development this also would seem to be among the responsibilities of the school. The extent to which such formal courses as psychology, labor relations, public speaking, and salesmanship can be effective in developing the student's facility in human relationships is uncertain, but it should be emphasized that these personal traits and skills are an important by-product of the entire university environment" (p. 556). While one may feel that the authors of this book are not fully cognizant of developments in the field of speech, one must conclude from their analysis that in the Colleges of Commerce lies a field which our profession should thoughtfully consider.

H. C. HARSHBARGER, *University of Iowa*

How To Be Interesting. By ROBERT E. ROGERS. Boston: L. C. Page and Company; 1931; pp. xii, 170; $2.00.

Robert E. Rogers is, of course, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology professor who, a year or two since, was reported to have said: "Be a snob; marry the boss' daughter" (or was it his stenographer?) His own efforts at being interesting have been spectacularly successful. From him, therefore, we expect some real information on this problem.

Professor Rogers himself says explicitly in his "Preliminary Justification" (note that if you want your preface read, call it something other than "Preface") that he has had much experience in being interesting. He has lectured to as many as 4,500 students in extension courses in one year—1,500 in one course. He has also been a teacher of public speaking, and has listened to hundreds of

student speeches. But it should be noted that the professor is not boasting; indeed, he is modest throughout the book, calling the work "this little book of platitudes," and really giving the impression that he puts no undue value on the treatise. The enrollment figures are given by way of apologetic explanation of why he is supposed to know something about interesting audiences.

The book is a rather informal, episodic essay on how to interest through the medium of oral discourse. It is in many respects like the treatment of interest to be found in any text-book of public speaking. It differs mainly in the fact that it is more interesting than most such treatments, and that this interest seems to be achieved in spite of violation of most of the text-book principles of unity, coherence, proportion, relevancy of illustration, and the like. It is not complete—many of the methods of interest are not mentioned, though most of those omitted are illustrated in the method and style of the author.

The problem seems to be, how shall the speaker of today make himself and his speech interesting to the audience? It is apparent that the author has in mind, for the most part, a speaker very much like himself—the extension lecturer trying to make Chaucer exciting to tired school teachers, or the professor trying to illumine Culture in the darkness of the Woman's Club. Now and then, it is true, he conscientiously tries to survey other types of speakers. But he seems to imply that the principles are of universal application. In the preface he voices the pious hope that amateur as well as professional speakers may profit from his book. Are we not all speakers today? Almost all, for "The strong, silent, man is getting to be an involuntary anachronism. The strong, silent, woman no longer exists."

In his first chapter, "Most People Have a Voice," Professor Rogers tells us that America is becoming voice conscious. He predicts that with the increased use of the radio we are going to listen more and read less. We need, then, good voices. The first step toward being interesting is to be able to speak "clearly, forcibly, correctly, like gentlefolk." Bernard Shaw's stage direction in Candida is quoted with approval: "A sound, unaffected voice, which he uses with the clean articulation of the practiced orator." Professor Rogers does not think Americans have good voices. The only good ones he has heard in his public speaking classes have been those of foreign origin. He declares that the schools should see to this

matter without delay. He recommends for those unable to receive the aid of a regular course in school, practice in reading aloud.

The second chapter considers the rhetorical and psychological methods of interesting audiences under the title of "People Like To Keep Awake." We are told that it is better to speak extempore than to read; that if you have to read, as over the radio, improvise or secure spontaneity somehow; cultivate oral style in written composition; never memorize; stand still; use gestures with considerable moderation; use good humor or none; talk the American language; use the conversational mode of composition; don't sag. The principles one misses, but which are abundantly illustrated in the author's own style, are the use of the specific and the concrete, the sensational, the appeal to imagination, antagonizing, and the effective phrase. The ones absent, both in content and in style, are unity, coherence, and the like. The writer is able to digress into polemics against Ph.D.'s, defenses of extension courses, and into other fields, without losing the attention and without leaving the path of the discussion entirely. There seems to be an irrepressible tendency, however, to amplify ideas with illustrations not quite germane to the point, so that the example becomes an excursion rather than an illumination. But all are provocative and stimulating.

The last three chapters are especially lacking in unity. In one, "The Culture Club of Keokuk," certain audiences either lacking in culture or hostile to it, are analyzed. The others are: "The Will to be Interesting," and "The Will to be Interested." While both these latter chapters explain how to enrich one's personality, the first on "The Will to be Interesting," is particularly concerned with the general problem of adaptation of personality to audience.

The precepts in this work are sound and sensible. They are, moreover, interestingly developed. It is good to find confirmation at the hands of the successful practitioner. One wishes for a greater condensation, for more relevancy, and, shall we say, for less of the William Lyon Phelps manner. But, in many respects, here is the public speaking text-book for classes composed of public speaking teachers. Perhaps, if Professor Rogers reads this, he will revise the title-page somewhat as follows: *"How To Be Interesting*: A Little Book of Platitudes for Folks in General, Including Students, Lecturers, Teachers of Public Speaking, and Other Low-Brows."

RUSSELL H. WAGNER, *Cornell University*

IN THE PERIODICALS

WARNER, M. LAVINIA: *The Remedial Treatment of a Case of Defective Speech Due to Deafness.* Psychological Clinic, 20, No. 3, May 1931, 85-91.

Case study of an "undetected problem child . . . , recognized as having a speech defect, but not considered to be totally deaf." By special, individual instruction, rapid progress was made both in regular studies and in speech. The need is stressed for better clinics in the public schools, to discover, study, and treat remedially these types of cases. G. W. G.

Dialect Notes, Vol. IV, Part II, 1930.

The entire number is given over to a discussion of the proposed project for a thorough dialect study of America, plans for a Dialect Dictionary, and a survey of the dialects of New England. A Linguistic Atlas is also proposed.

Various aspects of dialect are to be included in the investigation, among them being, (1) the influence on the spoken language of movements of population, topography, arteries of communication, stratification of society, and so on; (2) the relation of local dialects to the dialects of other localities; (3) the dialects of various social classes.

The aim is to cover all phases of spoken language: pronunciation, accentuation (including intonation and stress), inflections, syntax, and vocabulary, of all groups of society.

The survey will start with New England, because the dialects there are considered as "primary", in that they have more influence on the dialects of other regions than the reverse; because it has striking geographical and class dialects, and because we already have a considerable body of knowledge concerning the historical and linguistic development of New England. G. W. G.

CISIN, H. G.: *Modernizing Educational Methods through Radio Instruction.* The Nation's Schools, 8, No. 1, July 1931, 31-34.

More than twelve per cent (77 out of 627) of the licensed radio stations in the United States are owned and operated by educational institutions. The installation of radio receiving equipment in public and high schools is spreading rapidly. Fifty-three educational stations reported a weekly average of eight hours on the air, while two hundred eighty commercial stations reported a weekly average of seven and one-half hours devoted to educational broadcasting. In addition to the 77 institutions owning and operating stations, about eighty were making use of commercial stations.

Subjects that are being taught include civics and history, literature and art, travel and international affairs, music and calisthenics, and many others. The introduction of television will add many subjects not now possible.

In addition to radio reception, many schools are installing public address systems, permitting the use of centralized programs and instruction, without the disturbances attendant upon moving from one room to another.

Radio and its related techniques offer great possibilities in the field of education. G. W. G.

MORGAN, JOY E.: *The National Committee on Education by Radio.* Educational Record, 12, No. 3, July 1931, 353-358.

In contrast to the foregoing optimistic article, the present one "views with alarm" the lack of plan which seems to characterize the existing situation with respect to educational radio. We are, says Mr. Morgan, ten years behind where we ought to be, and far inferior to European practises in this regard. The situation is nothing less than serious.

In 1930, twenty three educational systems were crowded off the air, and many others were endangered. To combat the threatening encroachment of commercial interests, the National Committee on Education by Radio was formed to study the problems involved, and to act in an advisory capacity for the development of education by radio in the United States. G. W. G.

DORRANCE, GEORGE M.: *Congenital Insufficiency of the Palate;* Archives of Surgery. Vol. 21, No. 2, August, 1930. pp. 185-248.

A complete discussion of the embryology, etiology, and forms of a structural anomaly which may account for a number of nasal voices. A certain operative technique and post-operative training are suggested. "Operations of the pharyngeal wall are condemned because better results can be obtained by methodic speech training, as this causes hypertrophy of the superior constrictor muscle of the pharynx and permits the pterygopharyngeus portion of the superior constrictor muscle to assist the velum in securing velopharyngeal closure."

MILDRED F. BERRY, *Rockford College*

ENGERTH, GOTTFRIED and HOFF, HANS: *Function of the Frontal Lobes of the Cerebrum.* Zeitschr. Ges. Neurol. u. Psychiatr. 124, 1930, pp. 714-726.

The authors observed two right-handed patients with bone defects over the second and third frontal convolution. In epileptic attacks brought on by heating the cerebrum, motor aphasia with forced chewing movements was evident. Chewing impulses from the right hemisphere, the authors conclude, destroyed the function of speech. Moreover, they claim that the left hemisphere was assisted by the right because the patients had to chew in order to begin speaking. The right hemisphere acts as an inhibitor of chewing so that speech may take place. The left hemisphere deals with the higher processes; the right with the primitive vegetative functions.

M. F. B.

HINES, MARION: *Cerebral Localization.* Physiological Reviews, Vol. IX; No. 3; July, 1929. pp. 462-574.

The article contains a complete review of present day opinions on cortical localization. A discussion of aphasia is included. Mr. Hines says in this connection: "The damage in aphasia might be thought of as a disintegration of the function of symbolic representation. In this process three levels are exposed; at the highest level,

formulations of high propositional value, the more abstract types, take place; on the second, more automatic and simple integrations; and at the lowest level, symbolic expression of emotional states only. Although the data distribute the emphasis in the disorder in a certain relation to the localization of the cortical lesion, no plane can be drawn which cuts the difficulties analyzed into two distinct types, such as motor and sensory, or the sensory, again, into 'blindness' to spoken or written words. To the extent to which the disorder is one of parts and not of function as a whole, disintegration is not along clean cut anatomical lines; rather what might be called physiological moieties are attacked. From this point of view aphasia must be studied if understanding of speech difficulties is to progress."

M. F. B.

MACKLIN, CHARLES CLIFFORD: *The Musculature of the Bronchi and Lungs.* Physiological Reviews, Vol. IX, No. 1, January, 1929, pp. 1-61.

The author maintains that the smooth musculature of the bronchi and lungs plays a very real part in the rhythmic changes during respiration and should be given more consideration. "The steadiness and smoothness of the recoil process suggests, perhaps, that the mechanism may not be merely the rebound of an elastic tube following the removal of an extending force, but a movement in which muscular activity, coordinated under nervous influence, is a factor." In expiration, there is not a simultaneous narrowing over the whole system, but an expiratory wave begins in the airway terminals and travels to the larynx.

M. F. B.

TRAVIS, LEE and DORSEY, JOHN M.: *Mass Responsiveness in the Central Nervous System.* Archives of Neurology and Psychiatry, Vol. XXVI, No. 1, July, 1931, pp. 141-45.

The sound wave frequency in phonation and the frequency of the action current in the crico-thyroid muscle were found to be in synchronization. Moreover, it is claimed that the cerebral action current frequency also was synchronized with muscle frequency. The authors' conclusions give support to Coghill's theory of "dominant organic unity."

M. F. B.

GOLLA, F. L., and ANTONOVITCH, S.: *The Respiratory Rhythm in its Relation to the Mechanism of Thought,* Brain, Vol. LII, Part 4, 1929.

Observations were made on the respiratory volume and rhythm by means of a plethysmograph enclosing the whole body. Two types of habitual respiration have emerged and are approximately equally distributed among normal subjects of both sexes. The irregular respiratory type has been found in subjects with predominantly auditory imagery; the regular type in subjects with predominantly visual imagery. The irregular type has been found to become regular when a problem is tackled the solution of which requires purely visual images. M. F. B.

From the Phonetics Laboratory of the University of Hamburg, Germany, comes monthly a small but significant periodical appropriately called, "VOX." It is edited by Dr. G. Panconcelli-Calzia, Director of the Laboratory, and one of the most widely known of the world's phoneticians. The magazine is in its seventeenth year of publication.

The three issues that have recently come to this reviewer's desk (November, 1930, and May and August, 1931) are typical of the broad field covered in the articles to be found in VOX. Comparative phonetics, as well as experimental phonetics, are covered. Articles on Javanese, Hottentot, English, Mongolian find their place. In the May, 1931, number is an article by Dr. Muyskens (Michigan) on "An Analysis of Accent in English from Kymograph Records."

Besides the original articles, current literature is reviewed, books and articles from both European and American writers receiving due attention.

For the reader of German this periodical contains much rich material in the field of phonetics and kindred subjects.

G. W. G.

CONVENTIONS

THE 1931 CONVENTION, DECEMBER 28, 29, 30, AND 31 HOTEL STATLER, DETROIT

The National Association has so grown in breadth and diversity of interests that it is quite impossible to cover all phases of our field within the convention days without annoying and baffling conflicts and confusion. It seems, further, that contacts with our fellow teachers and informal and often impromptu discussions of current problems have their place with formal papers and scheduled meetings. Therefore, a shortened schedule of meetings has been adopted. This innovation plus extensive reports on graduate research in progress at the various institutions will be the new features added to the customary formal sessions and round table discussions at the 1931 convention.

In this convention all formal sessions will be confined to the morning and early afternoon hours, with adjournment for the day at 3:30 P. M. The remainder of the afternoons and evenings will be free for discussions, informal group meetings, and the like. We should have a large number of small discussion groups for topics of intimate and specialized interest. To further this plan, the management of the Hotel Statler has provided that at least one of our meeting rooms will be furnished as a members' lounge immediately following the sessions. Also there are a number of small rooms which can be assigned to groups either during or following the regular sessions. Thus we shall not be condemned to the lobby or corridors, but may hold impromptu gatherings of all kinds until the morning hours. Anyone wishing to call a meeting of this kind, for any group or any purpose, may communicate either with the President of the Association or with the chairman of the Special Meetings Committee, Ray Skinner of the College of the City of Detroit. Each morning the members in attendance will receive a mimeographed sheet showing the special and group meetings called for the day, with the time and place of each, and the bulletin boards

of the convention hall will contain hourly information. It is hoped that all members will avail themselves of this arrangement, and that informal round table discussions of mutual problems will be the order of the day.

Graduate research in the field of Speech has been growing to an astounding extent in the past few years. This research touches the teaching and theory of Speech in all its branches and at all school levels. Publication has not kept pace with the growing body of knowledge and techniques. All schools offering graduate work are being asked to invite their graduate students to attend the convention for all sessions, but particularly for those dealing with research and advanced work. Each graduate selected by his school will be given time to state his own problem, his methods, and tentatively any findings he may wish to make public. By this means it may well happen that the convention as a whole will have an opportunity to know what is being done, to see the general trends in graduate work, and to see the tremendous possibilities for increasing our store of knowledge.

The customary graded and topical sessions will be scheduled to cover as many phases of the work as possible. The graded sessions will represent the interests of the graduate schools, colleges, teachers' colleges, secondary and elementary schools. Rhetoric and Speech Construction, Interpretation, Drama and the Theatre, Voice Science, with their allied and neighboring fields will be included in the usual topical divisions. The American Society for the Study of Disorders of Speech will also make its contribution to the regular three-day program as well as continuing in full session throughout the fourth day.

The entire convention will be run as nearly as possible on a time schedule similar to that of last year, and the doors of the meeting rooms will show placards giving the names of the sections and the speakers. This will minimize interruptions of meetings and reduce the confusion sometimes resulting from unequally timed sections. All members will have small recognition badges which will admit them to all meetings and serve as an introduction to other convention members. These badges will be given out at the time of registration, so members are urged to register early and avoid later confusion. Ample registration facilities have been arranged, so delays will be reduced to an absolute minimum.

The Statler Hotel has given us every accommodation, assigning four large and four small meeting rooms on one floor, with a large foyer for registration and exhibit space. Guest rooms, garage facilities, and dining service are available at reasonable rates. Any additional information concerning the convention, meeting quarters, or the usual convention railroad rates may be obtained from the chairman of the Local Arrangements Committee, G. E. Densmore of the Univeristy of Michigan.

The 1931 convention has been given every physical facility for the comfort and convenience of the members of the Association. And the combination of formal papers with many informal discussions and unhurried contacts with fellow teachers should give our wide membership a new appreciation of the National Association as a center of professional interests and life.

EASTERN PUBLIC SPEAKING CONFERENCE

Secretary's Report

The twenty-second annual meeting was held at Smith College, Northampton, Mass., April 10-11, 1931. H. A. Wichelns, chairman, presided. The meeting was attended by seventy registered teachers and four registered students.

At the business session, called to order at 12:30 P. M., April 11, the minutes of the last session were accepted. A tentative financial statement, showing that the Conference would pay for itself, without touching the reserve in the treasury, was made by the chairman.

The nominating committee, consisting of Professors C. A. Fritz of New York University and H. H. Hudson of Princeton presented the following report, which was accepted without dissenting vote: Chairman: Professor A. B. Williamson of New York University, Vice-Chairman in charge of secondary school section:

Mrs. Letitia Raubicheck, Board of Education, N. Y. City.

Secretary-Treasurer:

Mrs. Jane Dorsey Zimmerman, Teachers College, Columbia.

Members of Executive Council:

Professor Edith W. Moses, Wellesley College.

Professor H. H. Hudson, Princeton University.

Professor H. A. Wichelns, Cornell University.

The resolutions committee, consisting of Professors E. L. Hunt of Swarthmore and W. M. Parrish of the University of Pittsburgh, presented the following resolutions, which were passed:

I. The Conference expresses its gratitude to Smith College and to the Department of Spoken English of Smith College for gracious hospitality in entertaining its twenty-second annual meeting.

II. The Eastern Public Speaking Conference observes with satisfaction the continued increase of interest in the study of speech, and recognizes the distinguished service of the National Association of Teachers of Speech in furthering this interest. We wish to affirm our conviction that the major emphasis of our united efforts should be upon higher standards of study and teaching. The National Association, as an organization of teachers and scholars, fosters, first of all, teaching, and, as indispensable to teaching, study and research. As a member Conference, we must disapprove such expansion, propaganda, and organization as divert the energies of members of our profession from those two interests.

III. We view with satisfaction the decision of the National Association to accept the invitation of regional groups and enlarge the circuit of its meeting-places, but urge upon the National Association a form of government which will at once secure continuity of policy and protect the interests of the great majority of members, inevitably absent from any single convention.

IV. The Eastern Public Speaking Conference interprets its main function to be the holding of an annual meeting; considers that its chief activity should be directed to the improvement of that meeting and increase in attendance upon it, and is of opinion that this interpretation makes possible complete co-operation with the enterprises of the National Association without wasteful duplication of effort.

V. The Eastern Public Speaking Conference looks with favor upon the proposal of the National Society for the Study

of Disorders of Speech to establish a section which shall meet conjointly with the Conference, and authorizes the Executive Committee to arrange programs accordingly.

This last resolution (IV) expressed the opinion of the committee appointed last year to study the advisability of a program of continuous functioning by the Eastern Conference. That committee consisting of E. L. Hunt of Swarthmore, Chairman, H. H. Hudson of Princeton, and J. Walter Reeves of Peddie School. The committee had before it a recommendation of activities that might be undertaken, submitted by a subcommittee consisting of Mrs. Letitia Raubicheck, chairman, J. Walter Reeves, W. M. Parrish, and D. C. Bryant, Albany State College. The subcommittee's recommendation follows: "In reviewing the objectives proposed by Mr. Paget in the well-known manifesto, it seemed to the committee that the only two which might properly be the work of the steadily-functioning committee, might be the securing of college credit for secondary school courses in Speech which maintain a certain high level; and second, the formulation of uniform objectives in the training of teachers and uniform standards for personal speech." The committee's decision on these recommendations follows: "The activities mentioned by the subcommittee are laudable enterprises, but they might better be carried on by the National Association. An executive office seems to be growing up in the National Association, and we think all enterprises which might be national in effect should proceed from the National Association with such help from the regional associations as they may be able to give. It is also the opinion of your committee that the members of the Eastern Conference can advance their work most effectively by unhampered individual effort. Our meetings will perform their function best if they give us an opportunity to exchange ideas and experiences without burdening us with a program of organized and regimented effort."

At the request of Miss Jane Bliss Taylor of Hunter College the chairman announced a special business meeting of members of the National Society for the Study of Disorders of Speech. The Conference adjourned at 1:00 P. M.

H. A. WICHELNS, *for the Secretary*

SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH

Second Annual Convention, April 16, 17, 18, 1931

The Second Annual Convention of the Southern Association of Teachers of Speech was held in the Henry Grady Hotel, Atlanta, Georgia, April 16, 17, and 18, 1931. It was a most successful convention from every standpoint, although certain features of the program were objected to by certain members present as shall be pointed out later. A number of constructive ideas were presented, and the Association gave every indication of continuing its growth and widening its sphere of activity and influence, as shall be detailed later.

Forty-one delegates, or more than one half of the members of the Association attended the convention. They represented nine Southern and two Northern and Eastern states.

As had been previously announced, the Association sponsored a group of speech contests in connection with its convention, including a debate tournament, oratorical, extemporaneous speaking, and poetry reading contests. This was one of the original aims and purposes of the association but because so much time and attention were diverted from the convention and association and centered in and around the various contests, objection arose from a number of members regarding the continuing of them as a feature of the program.

A bit of statistical data at this point might be interesting and illuminating. Fourteen debate teams, representing colleges and universities in seven different states were entered in the debate tournament. A silver cup was awarded to the winning team, representing North Texas State Teachers College at Denton. Second place went to the team from North Carolina State College at Raleigh. Contestants from nine colleges entered the extemporaneous speaking contest. First place went to Leonard Amos of N. C. State. North Texas State Teachers College came second with Birmingham-Southern winning third place. In the oratorical contest, Leonard Amos of N. C. State won first place. (The records having been lost, the other winners are not determined.) In the poetry reading contest, eleven colleges and one high school were represented. First place was awarded to Margaret Wallis, Alabama College, Second place to Dorothy Abel, Averitt College, and third place to Edith Hombrich, Norman Park High School.

The contests were very well carried out, and general satisfaction prevailed insofar as they themselves were concerned. All of them were judged by the various delegates from other institutions than those entered in the contest. Norman W. Mattis of Oklahoma Baptist University at Shawnee was director of the contests and the association is indebted to him for his tireless efforts toward making the entire scheme a success. Miss Frances K. Gooch also deserves the appreciation of the association for her work in arranging local details.

The Executive Committee met Thursday afternoon, April 16, at 4:30. The next convention city was discussed, and invitations were extended from New Orleans, Birmingham, Atlanta, and Asheville, North Carolina. Mr. Constans invited the association to consider some city in Florida. The plans of the National Association of Teachers of Speech to meet in New Orleans in 1934 were brought up, and the council voted unanimously to merge the 1935 convention of the Southern Association, with that of the National Association at Christmas, 1934, urging an important place on the program of the National Convention for Southern Teachers. Birmingham and Asheville were selected as the two cities for final choice as to the convention city for next year, to be determined by the vote of the entire convention.

Miss Osband moved that the Journal of Expression be adopted as the official magazine of the association for next year. Miss Gooch seconded and the motion was adopted.

No action was taken regarding the proposed fifth vice-president representing the private teachers.

Mr. Johnson discussed the point that the end of the fiscal year had never been determined, and asked that a definition be made.

Miss Gooch moved that each fiscal year end with the conclusion of that year's convention, annual dues being payable following that data. Miss Plonk seconded, and the motion was carried.

During the general session Friday morning, April 17, the Executive Secretary-Treasurer made the following financial report:

TREASURER'S REPORT, 1931

April 15, 1931

Receipts

Donations Prior to 1930 Convention				$83.00
Registration Fees 1930 Convention				$18.00
Memberships 1930-1931				
21	$42.00			
4	$12.00			
1	$3.75			
15	$60.00			
15	$67.00			
6	$28.00			
4	$20.00			
4	$22.00			
2	$11.00			
3	$19.00			
1	$7.25			
76			$294.00	
				$395.00

Expenditures

Prior to and including 1930 Convention			112.52	
1930-1931				
Stationery	$42.10			
Mimeographing	$16.72			
Stenographer	$38.75			
Office Supplies	.83		$98.40	
Monies Forwarded				
Journal of Expression, 8 subscriptions @ $2.50		$20.00		
Platform World, 15 subscriptions @ $1.00		$15.00		
Quarterly Journal,				
16 subscriptions @ $.50		$8.00		
9 subscriptions @ $.75		$6.75		
32 subscriptions @ $2.00		$64.00		
16 subscriptions @ $2.25		$36.00		
			$149.75	
				$360.67
Checks on hand $4.00				
Cash in bank $30.33				
				$34.33
				$395.00

Submitted as a true and correct Financial Statement of the Southern Association of Teachers of Speech.

Respectfully yours,

T. EARLE JOHNSON, *Treasurer*

The Resolutions Committee was appointed by the president, and the nominating committee was elected by blind ballot, without nominations from the floor.

Following this a general discussion was held. Mr. Judson moved that a committee of three be appointed by the president for the purpose of giving publicity to the next convention. Miss Gooch seconded, and the motion was carried.

The question of holding contests in connection with the convention was discussed. Mr. Constans, Mr. Connelly, and Mr. Judson

spoke against the practice; Mr. Paget, Mr. Johnson, and Mr. Mattis favored it. At Mr. Mattis' suggestion action was postponed until Saturday evening.

At the general meeting Friday afternoon, Dr. Trumbauer moved that the nominating committee be empowered to submit nominations for the assistant Editors of the Journal of Expression from the Southern Association. Miss Gooch seconded, and the motion was adopted.

Mr. Paget moved that the Southern Association approve the National Radio project, and pledge its aid. Mrs. Loveland seconded and the motion was adopted.

On Saturday afternoon at 2:00, a special general meeting was held to receive the report of the nominating committee, and to elect officers for next year.

The Nominating committee composed of Miss Johnson, Chairman, Miss Gooch, Mr. Constans, Mr. Evans, and Mr. Judson, submitted the following slate:

President	M. F. Evans
First Vice President	H. P. Constans
Second Vice President	Rose Johnson
Third Vice President	Carolyn Vance
Fourth Vice President	Louise Thomas
Executive Sec-Treas.	Edwin H. Paget

Editors of Journal of Expression:

T. Earle Johnson
Frances K. Gooch
Norman W. Mattis

Each member of the nominating committee dissented in each case where that member was nominated for an office by the committee.

Mr. Mattis nominated Edwin H. Paget for President. Mr. Paget was elected.

The nominees for the four vice-presidencies were elected by acclamation.

For Executive-Secretary-Treasurer, Mr. Paget nominated T. Earle Johnson, and Mr. Judson nominated M. F. Evans. Mr. Evans was elected Executive Secretary-Treasurer.

Mr. Mattis withdrew his name for Assistant Editor of the Journal of Expression. C. L. Shaver was nominated by Miss Thomas, and the three nominees, T. Earle Johnson, Frances K. Gooch, and C. L. Shaver were elected by acclamation.

At the General Session Saturday evening, the convention adopted Asheville, N. C., for the next year's convention city, the dates to be selected by the executive committee early in the fall.

Mr. Mattis made a report on the contests. He pointed out the advantages and disadvantages accruing from the contests, and urged that they be retained as a definite part of the program of the Southern Association. After a spirited discussion, Mr. Constans moved that the contests be held just prior to the convention, with the contest finals being on the first day's program of the convention. Mr. Evans seconded, and the motion was carried.

The Committee on Elementary and Secondary Speech Education presented the following recommendations:

1. To study more thoroughly the situation in each state accord- to the plan submitted by Miss Paul.
2. Southern Association to assume responsibility for publishing the results of this investigation in National and State Educational publications.
3. Make as ultimate objective that every student who goes out of Southern Teachers' Colleges have as a minimum a course in Fundamentals of Speech.
4. Request officials in charge of declamation contests to recommend that contests be judged only by recognized, trained teachers of speech, or those known to have high standards of judgment.
5. That the Southern Association request each of the state Educational Associations to make a place on their convention program for the State Speech Association; and that the National Speech Association do likewise with N. E. A. Adjust our time of annual convention to avoid conflict.

Signed—

PEARL BUCHANAN, *Chairman*
CAROLYN VANCE, *Secretary*

RESOLVED:

That the association express its hearty appreciation of the efforts of its officers to make this year and this convention successful for the Southern Association of Teachers of Speech.

That the Association extend thanks to Miss Frances Gooch for her efforts in behalf of this convention and express its appreciation of the hospitality of Agnes Scott College.

That the Association thank the following donors, who so kindly gave trophies; for Verse Speaking—"The New Poetry" by Harriet Monroe—given by MacMillan Company, Atlanta; for Extemporaneous Speaking—a solid gold piece given by Latham and Atkinson, Jewelers; for Debating—a solid silver cup, given by Mier and Berkele.

That the Southern Association of Teachers of Speech express its appreciation for the efforts made by the management and employees of the Henry Grady Hotel to facilitate the holding of this convention.

That the Association refer the matter of the project known as the National Shakespearean Memorial Camp to the Executive Council for further consideration, and empowers the Council to act for the Association.

Signed, HELEN OSBAND
MATTIS (Oklahoma)
PIERCE (Florida)

CONFERENCE ON STATE AND SECTIONAL ASSOCIATIONS

Luncheon held Monday, Dec. 29, 1930
F. M. Rarig, presiding

The discussion was opened by Professor Wichelns of Cornell, representing the Eastern Public Speaking Conference. He stressed two points: (1) the need for each sectional organization to have an *individual* objective as distinguished from a reduplication of the work of the National or other sectional organization; and (2) the need for either a more definite geographical division between sectional organizations, or the agreement that the divisions be made on other than geographical basis.

Professor Bassett of Stanford represented the Western Association of Teachers of Speech. He emphasized the debt of cooperation

which the sectional associations owed the national organization. Moreover, he suggested the mutual assistance that sectional organizations could give each other in the following ways:

(1) Exchange of information with regard to methods and standards.
(2) Cooperation in the preparation and presentation of sectional convention programs.
(3) Mutual help in bringing pressure to bear on school administrations.
(4) Assistance in the evaluation of transferred credit.

Professor Paget of North Carolina State College spoke for the Southern Association. The greatest value of sectional associations, according to him, lies in their ability to serve as units of liaison. They should cooperate with the national association, with other sectional associations, and draw together the state associations within their territories.

Professor Monroe of Purdue announced that steps were being taken to form a Central States Association or Federation, and that this organization might be expected to be in functioning order by the next national convention.

The greatest problem facing the sectional organization of this country was, in the consensus of opinion, the overlapping of the present organization with the resultant duplication of membership and geographical area.

It was felt that the luncheon had been of value, and that provision should be made at the next national convention for a similar luncheon at which time the matter of overlapping should be more thoroughly discussed.

ALAN H. MONROE, *Secretary, pro tempore*

THE THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE WESTERN ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH WILL BE HELD IN PASADENA, CALIFORNIA, NOVEMBER 26, 27, 28, 1931, AT THE COMMUNITY PLAYHOUSE. THE HOTEL HEADQUARTERS WILL BE THE MARYLAND. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION ADDRESS PROFESSOR LEE EMERSON BASSETT, STANFORD UNIVERSITY, CALIFORNIA.

NEWS AND NOTES

(Please send all items of general news interest directly to Miss Lousene Rousseau, 49 East 33rd Street, New York City.)

The growing recognition of the importance of speech work is indicated by the efforts of the National Broadcasting Company to raise speech standards throughout the country. Miss Vida Ravenscroft Sutton, the Voice and Diction Critic of the N. B. C., conducts weekly classes for announcers, all new announcers being required to take the course. The company also sponsors a weekly half-hour broadcast called "The Magic of Speech," which goes on the air over WEAF every Thursday at 4 o'clock. The first half of the period is devoted to lessons in voice and diction, and the latter half to programs of stories, poems, and plays. Leaflets containing lessons and exercises are sent each month to those who write in for them or who register for the course. During the summer special programs were presented in which the N. B. C. announcers were heard, for the benefit of the radio committee of the American Academy of Arts and Letters—the committee which annually selects the announcer whose work on the air entitles him to the medal for good diction awarded by the Academy. "The Magic of Speech" series for 1931-1932 began October 8th. Miss Sutton plans to make the program part of the broadcast center this year about American writers, including brief visits to the homes of early American writers, and readings and dramatizations of their works. The Parnassus Trio is furnishing special music. Special programs are being planned for Christmas, New Years, Washington's and Lincoln's birthdays, Easter, and May Day. The Speech Bureau of the N. B. C., under Miss Sutton's direction, is rapidly becoming a clearing house for information on all phases of speech problems.

The Eleventh Annual Conference of the Drama Teachers Association of California was held at the Hotel William Taylor in San Francisco late in the spring. The program was as follows:

"Mental Hygiene," Mrs. Mabel Gifford, Chairman, California Bureau of Speech Defects and Disorders.

"Case Studies," Dr. Albertine Richards Nash, Psychologist, San Francisco.

"Life Situations," Mr. K. J. Scudder, Superintendent, Whittier State School.

"Dramatic Art Comes of Age," Doris E. McEntyre, Director of Dramatic Art, Oakland Public Schools.

"High School and Junior College Playwrights," Irene Hoch, Modesto Junior College.

"The Voice of Beauty," Willian Hinsdale, College of the Pacific.
"Creating the Dramatic Club," Mary Sample, Arcata High School.
"Creative Dancing and Demonstration," Sarah Farrell Scott, San Francisco State Teachers College.
"Highlights of Speech Training in California Schools," Mrs. Evelyn Clement, Division of Teacher Training, State Board of Education.

The Fourth Annual Dramatic and Speech Institute was held at the University of Wisconsin, June 29 to July 11, under the direction of the Department of Speech of the University and the University Extension Division. On the staff were Miss Ethel Rockwell, director of the Bureau of Dramatic Activities of the University, Miss Cloyde Dalzell of the University of Southern California, Alethea Smith, Florida State College for Women, Claude M. Wise, University of Louisiana, Frederick Buerki, Kohler High School, and H. L. Ewbank, William C. Troutman, Robert West, William H. Varnum, Ruth Randolph, J. Russell Lane, and Eugene Bahn of the University. Courses were given in all phases of dramatic work, public speaking, and mental hygiene.

The Department of Speech of the Oregon State Teachers Association sponsored a State Speech Conference, which was held at Portland early in May. In resolutions unanimously approved, the Conference recommended to the superintendents and principals of the state that they give more consideration to the qualifications of elementary teachers in the speech arts; likewise that they provide for proper speech training in their schools, in Speech and English classes, by selecting teachers who are trained and capable of doing the work. About 150 teachers were in attendance during the Conference, at which the following papers were presented:

Session on Speech Training in the Elementary School

Miss Grace Bridges, Auditorium Supervisor Portland Platoon Schools, Presiding.

"Foundations in Oral English," demonstration with 4th grade pupils, Miss Ethel Wilson
"Auditorium Period Developed from History Department," with 8th grade pupils, Miss Agnes Matlock
"Auditorium Period Developed from Music Department," with 1st grade pupils, Miss Clara Smith
Discussion, led by Norman C. Thorne, Assistant Superintendent, Portland Public Schools; Mrs. Beulah Thornton, State Normal School, Monmouth; Agnes Arfstrom, Auditorium Director, Klamath Falls; and Earl W. Wells, Oregon State College.

Symposium on Secondary Speech Education

William G. Harrington, Franklin High School, Portland, Presiding.
"Speech Training for all Teachers," Miss Florence Johnson, Oregon State Normal

"Oral English as a Requirement for College Entrance," R. R. Turner, Superintendent Dallas Public Schools

"Content of High School Speech Courses," Miss Esther Hettinger, Marshfield High School

Luncheon Program

Earl W. Wells, Chairman, Department of Speech of Oregon State Teachers Association, Presiding.

"Proficiency in Speech as a Required Qualification for Teachers of English in the Portland System," Edgar H. Whitney, Assistant Superintendent, Portland

"How Speech Training Serves the General Aims of Education," Harold S. Tuttle, Professor of Educational Sociology, University of Oregon

"Speech Training in Relation to Personality," C. B. Mitchell, Oregon State College

"The Value of Oral Reading," E. F. Carleton, Editor, Oregon Educational Journal

---

In conjunction with the annual meeting of the Indiana State Teachers Association, the Indiana Association of Teachers of Speech held its third annual convention late in October. The main feature upon the program was an address by Dr. Clarence T. Simon, president of the National Association of Teachers of Speech. Another feature of the convention was a joint session with the teachers of English, at which an address was given by W. Norwood Brigance, of Wabash College, and a play presented by the University Players of Butler University.

An interesting feature of the 20th Biennial Convention of Zeta Phi Eta, National Honorary Professional Fraternity, which was held in Los Angeles in June, was the First Annual Poetry Reading Program. This contest was open to one representative from each chapter of the fraternity and to specially invited outsiders. Readers were allowed five minutes for their selections, and the arrangement of the program was in the hands of the chapter at Northwestern University. Preliminary arrangements were made by Tacie Hanna Rew and Mrs. Alice Mills, of the University of Southern California.

Teachers of speech in this country will be interested to know of the activities in this field in our farthest west university, the University of Hawaii, at Honolulu. Last April they fostered a unique series of international forensic contests, the first of which was an international oratorical contest in which nine speakers from four Japanese and two American universities participated. All orations were in the English language. A second contest was held in Japanese.

The next event was a Japan-America international debate, on the proposition: "Resolved, that the exclusion of Japanese immigrants by the United States is justifiable." The affirmative team was composed of two speakers from the University of Southern California and two from the University of

Hawaii. The negative team included two speakers from Hosei University, one from St. Paul's University, and one from Nihon University, all in Tokyo. The vote of the audience, which was almost half Japanese, showed a decided majority in favor of the proposition. This was the first debate in English in which Japanese university students participated. The Japanese speakers were members of the Japanese College Students Good-Will Tour, a party of eleven students and two professors, representing six universities in Tokyo, who spent three weeks in Hawaii as guests of the Hawaii Union, honorary forensic society at the University of Hawaii. N. B. Beck, faculty adviser on forensics of that institution, announces that these international contests will be held in alternate years.

As for dramatic activities, with the production of *The Faithful*, Masefield's English version of the Japanese classic of the forty-seven ronin, a new dramatic policy was inaugurated at the University of Hawaii. This policy, formulated by the recently organized University Theater Guild, is to produce four full-length plays during the regular academic year: a Chinese play acted by university students of Chinese descent, a Japanese play acted by students of Japanese descent, a Hawaiian pageant with an all-Hawaiian cast, and an English or American drama with haoles (Caucasians) as actors.

Twenty-four university students of Japanese descent were the cast of "The Faithful," which was produced May 6 and May 7. The combination of American acting, Japanese stage technique and modern lighting effects provoked editorial comment from the Honolulu newspapers, the Star-Bulletin describing the production as "the best student production yet presented in Honolulu."

The gorgeous costumes worn by the cast were secured by Shusui Hisamatsu, assistant director, from the Osaka theater district in Japan. Arthur E. Wyman, formerly of Christopher Morley's Hoboken theaters, is the director of dramatics at the University of Hawaii.

The summer school at Chautauqua, New York, offered a large number of speech courses during the past summer. The staff included Davis Edwards of the University of Chicago, A. B. Williamson of New York University, Claora Bell of New York University, Mrs. H. Lyle Campbell of the Morse School of Expression in St. Louis, Mrs. Evangeline Edwards of the Better English Institute of America, and Phoebe Guthrie of New York City. Courses were scheduled in play production, voice training, public speaking, parliamentary procedure, speech correction, and the teaching of speech.

Carroll College reports increased activity in the Speech Department there, with nearly two hundred students enrolled in speech courses, out of a total enrollment of less than five hundred. A speech clinic has been organized, under the direction of Vernon Utzinger. A total of thirty-nine debates, with twenty-two colleges, has kept forty students busy this past year, and still others participated in the oratorical and extempore speaking contests. The department also sponsors a Lyceum Bureau, which furnishes programs, read-

ings, speeches, debates, etc., to various organizations in the community. Mr. Utzinger has given a series of talks on practical public speaking over radio station WTMJ of Milwaukee.

The Wisconsin High School Forensic Association, which now comprises 375 schools, is beginning the seventh year of activity. The question chosen for the state debate this year is: "Resolved, that the several states should enact legislation providing for compulsory unemployment insurance." Contests will also be held in dramatic productions, oratory, declamation, extemporaneous reading, and extemporaneous speaking.

The fourteenth annual State Championship Debate of the Michigan High School Debating League was held at Ann Arbor, under the direction of the University Extension Division, in May. Five thousand people heard the debate, of which number two thousand were high school pupils who had come to Ann Arbor as delegates from 175 high schools throughout the state. This year's question, like that of Wisconsin, concerns compulsory unemployment insurance.

The first national speech tournament of the National Forensic League, held at Ripon, Wisconsin, May 7-9, has been generally proclaimed a remarkable achievement. 138 contestants, representing forty-nine schools, in seventeen states, from Maine to Alabama to Oklahoma to South Dakota, participated in forty-seven debates and fifty-five contests in other speech activities. In addition to the fifty-three coaches who accompanied the contestants, the judges for these events included twenty from Ripon and vicinity, and thirty from other colleges and universities.

DRAMATICS

On May 14 the Little Theatre of the University of Arkansas produced *The Antigone* of Sophocles in their new amphitheatre, before an audience which numbered more than three thousand. The forty or more persons taking part in the production were chosen from faculty and students of the University. Virgil L. Baker directed the production. Other dramatic productions at Arkansas during the past year included *The Show-Off, Daddy Long-Legs, The Valiant, The Maker of Dreams, Good Medicine, The Lady Loses her Hoop, and The Wonder Hat.*

A one-act play contest was held at the State Teachers College at Kirksville, Missouri, late last spring, in which nineteen plays were presented by high schools of the state. Miss Helene Blattner, of the University of Iowa, acted as judge of the contest. The plays entered were Sutro's *The Man on the Kerb,* Steele's *The Giant's Stair,* Kelley's *Poor Aubrey,* and *The Flattering Word,* Goodman's *The Game of Chess,* Halman's *Will o' the Wisp,* Goodman's *Back of the Yards, When a Clown Laughs,* by Geneve Harrison, *The First Dress Suit,* by Russell Medcraft, *The House by the Side of the Road,* by

August Von Kotsebue, *Brothers in Arms*, by Merrill Dennison, *The Monkey's Paw*, by W. W. Jacobs, *Young America*, by Fred Ballard and Pearl Franklin, *The Knave of Hearts*, by Louise Saunders, and *Mirage*, by George M. P. Baird.

The University of Minnesota offered a special round table in the dramatic arts from June 15 to July 25, designed for high school directors of dramatics. The faculty included C. Chatwood Burton, professor of architecture of the University, Earle G. Killeen, professor of music there, Edward M. Staadt, director of dramatics there, Miss Winifred Lenihan, director of the Theatre Guild School in New York, S. R. McCandless, specialist in stage lighting, of Yale University, Lester Raines, dramatic director of the New Mexico Normal University, Miss Alice Schoelkopf, specialist in costume design of Columbia University, and Miss Maud Scheerer, specialist in voice control, New York. Guest stars for the various productions scheduled during the summer were William Faversham, Edward Fielding, Paul Keast, Zamah Cunningham, and Ernest Lawford. Full university credit was given for the courses pursued.

Sock and Buskin Club of Western Reserve University presented, just before the close of the school year, a program of four original one-act plays: *Second Thought*, by Marjorie L. Lloyd, *The Flying Dragon*, by Marjorie McCreary, *The Return*, by Ethel R. Crawford, and *The Second Quest*, by Kenneth Bates. The plays were written by students in the Cleveland College course in playwriting.

In the Greek Theatre at the Bennett School at Milbrook, New York, the tenth Annual Drama Festival was held during four afternoons in May. *The Electra* of Euripides was presented by Edith Wynne Matthison, Margaret Gage, and Charles Rann Kennedy, assisted by the Drama, Music, and Art Departments of the school.

Arnold Bennett's *Milestones* and Josephine Preston Peabody's *The Piper* were the major dramatic productions during the spring term at Leland Powers School in Boston.

Summer session plays at the University of South Dakota were *Gammer Gurton's Needle*, and Brighouse's *Ghosts of Windsor Park*. The productions were in charge of Miss Willian Hinsdale, of the College of the Pacific, who conducted the summer work in the place of C. E. Lyon, who went to the College of the Pacific for the summer.

Recent productions at the Maryville State Teachers College, North Dakota, included Milne's *A Perfect Alibi*, and Barry's *The Youngest*. Miss Annabel Wood directed both productions.

PERSONALS

Dean Ralph Dennis of the School of Speech, Northwestern University, was granted the honorary degree of Doctor of Humane Letters by Wabash College in June.

J. R. Pelsma, of Kansas State Teachers College, Pittsburgh, is on sabbatical leave this year, studying at the University of London, and touring Europe, making a study of the teaching of speech in the important universities. He expects to return June first, by way of the Orient. Miss E. Madge Jones will be in charge of speech work during his absence.

Lionel Crocker, of Denison University, taught at the Michigan State Normal College in Ypsilanti during the summer session.

Myron G. Phillips, of Wabash College, received his M.A. degree from the University of Iowa in August.

Earl Fleischman was in charge of the eight weeks summer Vacation Camp at Lake Charlevoix, Michigan, during the past summer. Theatre Arts were featured during the entire period.

Miss Ethel Daum, who studied at Cornell University last year, has returned to the Indiana State Teachers College. E. M. Gifford is now on leave of absence from that department studying at Wisconsin.

Elwood Murray, who was recently granted his Ph.D. degree by the University of Iowa, has gone to the University of Denver, where he occupies the place left vacant by the death of Mrs. Kingsley some two years ago.

H. B. McCarty of the Speech staff at the University of Wisconsin, is at present serving as director of WHA, the oldest educational broadcasting station in the world.

D. J. Nabors is the new head of the Department of Speech of the State Teachers College at Peru, Nebraska. He took his M.A. degree at the University of Wisconsin.

Miss May N. Rankin, for thirty years professor of oratory at Carroll College, died in April. Miss Margaret Constance of Wesley College, Grand Forks, North Dakota, has been appointed to succeed her.

Miss Laura Shaw, dramatic director at the State Teachers College at Kalamazoo, Michigan, is spending the fall in New York City, studying phonetics.

J. Richard Bietry has resigned his position in the State High School at Kalamazoo, and has joined the Speech staff at the Los Angeles Junior College.

Mrs. Ruth Huston-Whipple has resigned her position at Northwestern High School, Detroit, and is living in Plymouth, Michigan.

Under the title "A Heavy Loss" the September issue of the English Journal carries the following account of Professor S. A. Leonard's death:

> "On the morning of May 16 the papers of many cities carried the news of the drowning of Professor S. A. Leonard. He had gone out on Lake Mendota, near the University of Wisconsin campus, in his pontoon canoe (with sail) which was overturned by the wind. Professor I. A. Richards, of Cambridge, who was with him and with whom he had been eagerly discussing a number of language experiments, almost lost his own

life in trying to help. A tragic series of circumstances prevented the discovery and rescue which would ordinarily have taken place.

Professor Leonard served as president of the National Council of Teachers of English in 1926, and has for years been chairman of its very important Committee on Essentials. In this latter capacity he stimulated much investigation of curriculum materials and methods, and led in a series of studies soon to be published by the Council as a monograph on usage. As chairman of the Curriculum Commission's Committee on Essential English (everything except literature and creative writing) for the Secondary Level, he was directing most energetically the work of five sub-committees.

Professor Leonard was the author of two of the most-quoted books on the teaching of English: *English Composition as a Social Problem*, and *Essential Principles of Teaching Reading and Literature*. Besides these, and almost innumerable magazine articles, he had produced a dozen volumes for pupils.

A memorial service was held in Madison on May 22, and that evening at an organization meeting of the Milwaukee English Club brief tributes were paid by Maurice W. Moe, of Milwaukee, President Lyman and Secretary Hatfield of the National Council of Teachers of English."

Professor Leonard was always deeply interested in the correlation of high school English and Speech. His untimely death is a great loss, not only to the field of English, but to the field of Speech as well.

Just at the beginning of the 1931 Summer Session, Mr. Edward Staadt, who for a number of years has had charge of dramatics at the University of Minnesota, was drowned while swimming. Shortly before his death, he completed two volumes of plays, one of which has already been published. The other is about to be published by his friends.

On July 13th, Mr. Claude Kantner of the Department of Speech at the University of Wisconsin, attended in Tokyo "The Second Annual English Oratorical Contest" held under the auspices of the Upton Close Oriental Culture Expedition and the Japan Inter-Collegiate English Students' League. The speakers represented Vassar College, the University of Southern California, Kansas University, Williams College, St. Paul's University, Tokyo Imperial University, Tokyo Commercial College, and Keio University. The judges were: Mr. Hiram Bingham, American Consul in Tokyo; Mr. Kanesada Hanazona, Tokyo Nichi Nichi; Dean Roy Hewitt, Upton Close Expedition; Mr. Torao Kawasaki, Foreign Office; Mr. Yoshio Nitobe, Editor of the Japan Times; Professor Yoshitara Negishi, St. Paul's University. First place was awarded to Mr. Mitchell of Southern California, who spoke on "Economic Rights in a World Community." Miss Lasker of Vassar was second with her speech on "Race Prejudice as Manifested in the American College," and Mr. Shiozawa of Tokyo Commercial was third with the subject, "Let us Exchange the Best We Have." Mr. Kantner says: "About two thousand people heard the contest. With the exception of possibly one hundred Americans, all were Japanese students who spoke or at least understood English. Four members

of our party and four English-speaking Japanese students competed. It was the longest contest I have ever sat through, but the Japanese bore it very patiently. The judging was, of course, very difficult. The Japanese are too courteous to judge impartially. As a result the American team won."

The National Convention of Delta Sigma Rho was held at Northwestern University June 22 and 23. Delegates from all but four of the sixty-five chapters were present. The following officers were elected for the next five-year period:

President—H. L. Ewbank, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin
Vice-President—Allan Nichols, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.
Vice-President—Brooks Quimby, Bates College, Lewiston, Maine.
Vice-President—Raymond F. Howes, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri
Vice-President—Earl W. Wells, Oregon State College, Corvallis, Oregon
Vice-President—E. W. Miller, Wooster College, Wooster, Ohio
Editor of the Gavel—H. A. White, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska
Treasurer—Gilbert L. Hall, Wilkins Building, Washington, D. C.
Secretary—Kathleen Duggan, 802 Chandler Building, Washington, D. C.